

September 22, 2015

# TAMENESS, UNIQUENESS TRIPLES AND AMALGAMATION

ADI JARDEN

ABSTRACT. We combine two approaches to the study of classification theory of AECs:

- (1) that of Shelah: studying non-forking frames without assuming the amalgamation property but assuming the existence of uniqueness triples and
- (2) that of Grossberg and VanDieren [8]: (studying non-splitting) assuming the amalgamation property and tameness.

In [9] we derive a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame from a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame. But the classes  $K_{\lambda^+}$  and  $\preceq \upharpoonright K_{\lambda^+}$  are replaced:  $K_{\lambda^+}$  is restricted to the saturated models and the partial order  $\preceq \upharpoonright K_{\lambda^+}$  is restricted to the partial order  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$ .

Here, we avoid the restriction of the partial order  $\preceq \upharpoonright K_{\lambda^+}$ , assuming that every saturated model (in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ ) is an amalgamation base and  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models, (in addition to the hypotheses of [9]): Theorem 7.15 states that  $M \preceq M^+$  if and only if  $M \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M^+$ , provided that  $M$  and  $M^+$  are saturated models.

We present sufficient conditions for three good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frames: one relates to all the models of cardinality  $\lambda^+$  and the two others relate to the saturated models only. By an ‘unproven claim’ of Shelah, if we can repeat this procedure  $\omega$  times, namely, ‘derive’ good non-forking  $\lambda^{+n}$  frame for each  $n < \omega$  then the categoricity conjecture holds.

In [18], Vasey applies Theorem 7.8, proving the categoricity conjecture under the above ‘unproven claim’ of Shelah.

In [12], we apply Theorem 7.15, proving the existence of primeness triples.

## CONTENTS

|                                                                                                         |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1. Introduction                                                                                         | 2  |
| 2. Non-forking Frames                                                                                   | 5  |
| 3. Variants of Tameness                                                                                 | 10 |
| 4. Deriving Non-Forking Frames Using Tameness                                                           | 13 |
| 5. Continuity Yields Symmetry                                                                           | 16 |
| 6. The Relation $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$                                                              | 18 |
| 7. Are the Relations $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$ and $\preceq \upharpoonright K_{\lambda^+}$ Equivalent? | 21 |
| 8. Proving Continuity                                                                                   | 29 |
| 9. Getting Good Non-Forking $\lambda^+$ -Frames                                                         | 35 |
| 10. Meanings of Galois-Types                                                                            | 37 |
| 11. Continuations                                                                                       | 39 |

|                 |    |
|-----------------|----|
| Acknowledgments | 39 |
| References      | 39 |

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The notion of a good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame was introduced by Shelah [14, II]. It is an axiomatization of the non-forking relation in superstable first order theories. The goal of the study of good non-forking frames is to classify AECs. If the amalgamation property does not hold then the definition of a galois-type is problematic. So Shelah added the amalgamation property to the axioms of a good non-forking frame.

Shelah [14, II.3] found cases, where we can prove the amalgamation property in a specific cardinality  $\lambda$  and to prove the existence of a non-forking relation, relating to models of cardinality  $\lambda$ . This is the reason, why Shelah defined the non-forking relation in a good non-forking frame as relating to models of a specific cardinality,  $\lambda$ , only (so the amalgamation in  $\lambda$  property is one of the axioms of a good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame, but the amalgamation property is not!).

Shelah [14, II] presented a way to extend a good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame to models of cardinality greater than  $\lambda$  and proved that several axioms are preserved. But the amalgamation property and Axioms 1.1 are hard to be proved even for models of cardinality  $\lambda^+$ .

*Axioms 1.1.*

- (1) Extension,
- (2) Uniqueness,
- (3) Basic stability and
- (4) Symmetry.

We now consider models of cardinality  $\lambda^+$  only. In order to get the amalgamation property and Axioms 1.1, there were introduced two approaches:

- (1) Shelah's approach: to change the AEC, such that the amalgamation and Axioms 1.1 will be satisfied,
- (2) the tameness approach for non-forking frames: to add the tameness property to the hypotheses.

In Shelah's approach, the relation  $\preceq \restriction K_{\lambda^+}$  is restricted to the relation  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  (see Definition 6.9). One advantage of the relation  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  is that  $(K_{\lambda^+}, \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF})$  satisfies the amalgamation property (even if  $(K_{\lambda^+}, \preceq \restriction K_{\lambda^+})$  does not satisfy the amalgamation property). So we get artificially the amalgamation in  $\lambda^+$  property. But a new problem arises: the pair  $(K_{\lambda^+}, \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF})$  may not satisfy smoothness (one of the axioms of AEC). In order to solve this problem, the class of models of cardinality  $\lambda^+$  is restricted to the saturated models of cardinality  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$  (and we assume that there are not many models of cardinality  $\lambda^{++}$ ).

Shelah [14].II derived a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame, using Shelah's approach: he proved that in the new AEC (the class of saturated models with the relation  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$ ) all the axioms of a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame are satisfied, assuming additional hypotheses. Jarden and Shelah [9, Theorem 11.1.5] generalized the work done in [14].II: they introduced the notion of a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame. It is a generalization of a good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame, where the stability hypothesis is weakened. Jarden and Shelah proved that we can derive a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame, from a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame, assuming similar additional hypotheses.

In order to clarify the importance of Shelah's approach to the solution of the categoricity conjecture, we have to recall the following definition: Roughly, we say that a good non-forking  $\lambda$  frame is  $n$ -successful when we can derive a good non-forking  $\lambda^{+m}$ -frame for each  $m \leq n$  (for a precise definition, see [9, Definition 10.1.1]).  $\omega$ -successful means  $n$ -successful for every  $n < \omega$ .

Shelah [14, III.12.40] claims the following (he did not publish a proof yet):

**Conjecture 1.2.** *Assume that  $2^\lambda < 2^{\lambda^+}$  for each cardinal  $\lambda$ . Let  $(K, \preceq)$  be an AEC such that there is an  $\omega$ -successful good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame with underlying class  $K_\lambda$ . Then  $K$  is categorical in some  $\mu > \lambda^{+\omega}$  if and only if  $K$  is categorical in each  $\mu > \lambda^{+\omega}$ .*

The main advantage of Shelah's approach is that we do not assume that the amalgamation property holds.

Shelah's approach has two disadvantages:

- (1) We change the class  $K$  and the partial order  $\preceq$  and
- (2) not every good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame is 1-successful.

We now consider the tameness approach. Grossberg and VanDieren [8] introduced the tameness property. They used this notion to prove an upward categoricity theorem.

The assumption of tameness is reasonable, not only because the natural AECs are tame, but also because Boney and Unger proved that there is a connection between tameness and large cardinal axioms.

The following fact is due to Boney:

**Fact 1.3.** [2, Theorem 1.3]: *If  $(K, \preceq)$  is an AEC with LST-number less than  $\kappa$  and  $\kappa$  is strongly compact then  $(K, \preceq)$  is  $\kappa$ -tame.*

Boney and Unger [6, Corollary 4.13] proved the following:

**Fact 1.4.** *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *Every AEC is tame.*
- (2) *There are class many almost strongly compact cardinals.*

In 2006, <sup>1</sup> Grossberg raised the conjecture that one main values of tameness allows one to go from a non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame to a non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame

---

<sup>1</sup>in a private conversation, during the American Institute of Mathematics Workshop on the Classification Theory for Abstract Elementary Classes on Palo Alto

without changing the AEC (in contrast to Shelah's approach). Several years ago, we checked the conjecture and saw that only the symmetry axiom does not hold by the known proofs.<sup>2</sup>

This was the beginning of the tameness approach for non-forking frames. It is a combination of Grossberg and VanDieren's approach and Shelah's approach.

Let us explain the idea of this conjecture. Since we do not want to change the AEC, we must assume the amalgamation in  $\lambda^+$  property. Uniqueness (of the non-forking extension of a type) for models of cardinality  $\lambda^+$  is implied easily by  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness (relating to basic types, see below). The proofs of the extension property and basic stability in  $\lambda^+$  in [9] can be applied here. So our main challenge is to get symmetry. We conjectured that symmetry holds as well.

Recently, the symmetry axiom was proved under three different hypotheses (in chronological order):

- (1) Boney [3] proved it, assuming a strong version of tameness: tameness for two elements,
- (2) in Proposition 5.6, it is proved, assuming the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -continuity of independence of sequences of length 2 property and
- (3) Boney and Vasey [7] proved that tameness implies tameness for two elements, so actually they proved the symmetry axiom assuming tameness, solving our conjecture.

[While VanDieren and Vasey [16] proved a downward transfer of the symmetry property for splitting, here the issue is an *upward* transfer of the symmetry property of a *general* non-forking notion].

It is desirable to avoid assuming the amalgamation in  $\lambda^+$  property, whenever it is possible. So we first derive a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame minus amalgamation, assuming the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -continuity of serial independence property ('minus amalgamation' means that the amalgamation property in  $\lambda^+$  may hold and may not hold). Then we present sufficient conditions for the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -continuity of serial independence property.

We prefer to assume that every saturated model is an amalgamation base than to assume that  $(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the amalgamation property. This is the motivation for defining the second candidate of a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame:  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$ . The AEC of  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$  is the class of saturated models in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$  with the relation  $\preceq$ .

In Section 10, we recall the definition of the third candidate,  $\mathfrak{s}^+$ , for a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame. The AEC of  $\mathfrak{s}^+$  is the class of saturated models in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$  with the relation  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$ .

The theorems in this paper are divided into two kinds:

---

<sup>2</sup>On June 18 2013, we wrote in an e.mail to Grossberg, that we have almost proved the following thing: if we have a good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame and the amalgamation and tameness properties hold for the eight successive cardinals then we have a good non-forking frames in these eight cardinals.

- (1) Sufficient conditions for the equivalence between the relations  $\preceq \upharpoonright K_{\lambda^+}$  and  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  and
- (2) sufficient conditions, under which  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$ ,  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$  or  $\mathfrak{s}^+$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame.

Recall [9, Definition 1.0.25]:

**Definition 1.5.**  $K^{sat}$  is the class of saturated models in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ .

The main theorems of the paper are:

**Theorem 1.6** (Theorem 7.15). *Suppose:*

- (1)  $K$  is categorical in  $\lambda$ ,
- (2)  $\mathfrak{s}$  is a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame,
- (3)  $\mathfrak{s}$  satisfies the conjugation property,
- (4) the class of uniqueness triples satisfies the existence property,
- (5) every saturated model in  $\lambda^+$  is an amalgamation base and
- (6)  $(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models property.

Then for every two models  $M, M^+ \in K^{sat}$  the following holds:

$$M \preceq M^+ \Leftrightarrow M \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M^+.$$

**Theorem 1.7** (Theorem 9.4). *Suppose:*

- (1)  $\mathfrak{s} = (K, \preceq, S^{bs}, \mathbb{U})$  is a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame,
- (2)  $\mathfrak{s}$  satisfies the conjugation property,
- (3) every saturated model in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$  is an amalgamation base,
- (4)  $(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models property and
- (5) the class of uniqueness triples satisfies the existence property.

Then  $\mathfrak{s}^+$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame.

Let us describe the structure of the paper. In Section 2, we present sufficient conditions for  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  and for  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$  being good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frames. In Sections 3 and 4, we show the contribution of tameness. In Section 5, we show the connection between the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -continuity of serial independence property and the symmetry axiom. In Section 6, we study the relation  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  as a replacement of  $\preceq \upharpoonright K_{\lambda^+}$ . In Section 7, we present sufficient conditions for the equivalence between the relations  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  and  $\preceq$ . In Section 8, we apply the results of Section 7, proving the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -continuity of serial independence property. In Section 9, we apply results from previous sections, presenting sufficient conditions for  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  and of  $\mathfrak{s}^+$  being good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frames. In Section 10, we show that even if the relations  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  and  $\preceq$  are not equivalent, the definitions of ‘type’ in the different AECs considered here, coincide.

## 2. NON-FORKING FRAMES

Shelah [14].III introduced the notion of a good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame. It is an axiomatization of the non-forking relation in superstable first-order

theories. In [9, Definition 2.1.3], good non-forking frames generalized to semi-good non-forking frames: the stability hypothesis is weakened.

Recall,

**Definition 2.1.** A (semi-)good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame is a quadruple,  $(K, \preceq, S^{bs}, \mathbb{U})$  such that the following hold:

- (1)  $(K, \preceq)$  is an AEC with  $LST$ -number  $\lambda$  at most, satisfying the joint embedding in  $\lambda$  and amalgamation in  $\lambda$  properties, and  $(K, \preceq)$  has no maximal model of cardinality  $\lambda$ ,
- (2)  $S^{bs}$  is a function of  $K_\lambda$  such that  $S^{bs}(M)$  is a set of non-algebraic types;  $S^{bs}$  is closed under isomorphisms; it satisfies density and basic (almost) stability  $|S^{bs}(M)| \leq \lambda^+$  for each model  $M$  of cardinality  $\lambda$  and
- (3)  $\mathbb{U}$  is closed under isomorphisms and satisfies the monotonicity, local character, uniqueness, symmetry, extension and continuity axioms.

**Definition 2.2.** An AEC in  $\lambda$  is defined similarly to AEC, but its models are of cardinality  $\lambda$ . So it is closed under unions of increasing continuous sequences of length less than  $\lambda^+$  only and the existence of a  $LST$ -number is irrelevant.

**Definition 2.3.** A (semi-)good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame of the second version is defined similarly to a (semi-)good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame, except the following difference:  $(K, \preceq)$  is an AEC in  $\lambda$  (in place of an AEC).

**Proposition 2.4.** Let  $(K, \preceq)$  be an AEC. The following are equivalent:

- (1) there are  $S^{bs}, \mathbb{U}$  such that  $(K, \preceq, S^{bs}, \mathbb{U})$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame.
- (2) there are  $S^{bs}, \mathbb{U}$  such that  $(K_\lambda, \preceq \upharpoonright K_\lambda, S^{bs}, \mathbb{U})$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame of the second version.

*Proof.* By Fact [9, 1.0.18]. ⊣

From now on, we assume:

*Hypothesis 2.5.*

- (1)  $(K, \preceq)$  is an AEC and
- (2)  $\mathfrak{s} = (K, \preceq, S^{bs}, \mathbb{U})$  is a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame.

**Remark 2.6.** By [10], without loss of generality, for each  $M \in K_\lambda$   $S^{bs}(M) = S^{na}(M)$ , namely, the basic types are the non-algebraic types. Anyway, we do not use it.

We recall [9, Definition 2.6.1], where we extend the non-forking relation to include models of cardinality greater than  $\lambda$ .

**Definition 2.7.**  $\mathbb{U}^{\geq \lambda}$  is the class of quadruples  $(M_0, a, M_1, M_2)$  such that:

- (1)  $\lambda \leq ||M_i||$  for each  $i < 3$ .
- (2)  $M_0 \preceq M_1 \preceq M_2$  and  $a \in M_2 - M_1$ .

- (3) For some model  $N_0 \in K_\lambda$  with  $N_0 \preceq M_0$  for each model  $N \in K_\lambda$ ,  $N_0 \preceq N \preceq M_1 \Rightarrow \bigcup(N_0, a, N, M_2)$ .

**Definition 2.8.** Let  $M_0, M_1$  be models in  $K_{\geq \lambda}$  with  $M_0 \preceq M_1$  and  $p \in S(M_1)$ . We say that  $p$  does not fork over  $M_0$ , when for some triple  $(M_1, M_2, a) \in p$  we have  $\bigcup^{\leq \lambda}(M_0, a, M_1, M_2)$ .

**Remark 2.9.** We can replace the quantification ‘for some’  $(M_1, M_2, a)$  in Definition 2.8 by ‘for each’.

**Definition 2.10.** Let  $M \in K_{> \lambda}$ ,  $p \in S(M)$ .  $p$  is said to be *basic* when there is  $N \in K_\lambda$  such that  $N \preceq M$  and  $p$  does not fork over  $N$ . For every  $M \in K_{> \lambda}$ ,  $S_{> \lambda}^{bs}(M)$  is the set of basic types over  $M$ . Sometimes we write  $S_{\geq \lambda}^{bs}(M)$ , meaning  $S^{bs}(M)$  or  $S_{> \lambda}^{bs}(M)$  (the unique difference is the cardinality of  $M$ ). Similarly, we define  $S_{\lambda^+}^{bs}$  and  $\bigcup_{\lambda^+}$ .

We now define the first candidate for a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame (of the second version).

**Definition 2.11.** Let  $\mathfrak{s}$  be a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame. We define  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+} = (K_{\lambda^+}, \preceq \upharpoonright K_{\lambda^+}, S_{\lambda^+}^{bs}, \bigcup_{\lambda^+})$ .

We restate [9, Proposition 3.1.9(1)] as:

**Fact 2.12.** *Let  $\mathfrak{s}$  be a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame. Then there is no maximal model of cardinality  $\lambda^+$ .*

The following fact is an immediate consequence of [9, Theorem 2.6.8].

**Fact 2.13.** *Let  $\mathfrak{s}$  be a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame. Then  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  satisfies the density, monotonicity, local character and continuity axioms.*

**Proposition 2.14.** *If  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  satisfies Axioms 1.1 then it is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame minus the joint embedding and amalgamation properties.*

*Proof.* By Fact 2.13 and Fact 2.12. ⊢

We now define the second candidate for a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame (of the second version): the ‘restriction’ of  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  to the saturated models in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ .

**Definition 2.15.** Let  $\mathfrak{s}$  be a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame. We define  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat} = (K^{sat}, \preceq \upharpoonright K^{sat}, S_{\lambda^+}^{bs} \upharpoonright K^{sat}, \bigcup_{\lambda^+} \upharpoonright K^{sat})$ , where  $\bigcup_{\lambda^+} \upharpoonright K^{sat}$  is the class of quadruples in  $\bigcup_{\lambda^+}$  such that the three models are in  $K^{sat}$ .

**Remark 2.16.** The pair  $(K^{sat}, \preceq \upharpoonright K^{sat})$  is an AEC in  $\lambda^+$  if and only if for every limit ordinal  $\delta < \lambda^{++}$  and every increasing continuous sequence,  $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ , of models in  $K^{sat}$ , we have  $\bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha \in K^{sat}$ .

**Proposition 2.17.** *Let  $\delta$  be a limit ordinal with  $\lambda < cf(\delta)$  and let  $\langle N_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$  be an increasing continuous sequence of models in  $K^{sat}$ . Then  $\bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} N_\alpha \in K^{sat}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M$  be a model of cardinality  $\lambda$  such that  $M \preceq \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} N_\alpha$ . Since  $\lambda < cf(\delta)$ , for some  $\beta < \delta$ ,  $M \subseteq N_\beta$ . Since  $M \preceq \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} N_\alpha$  and  $N_\beta \preceq \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} N_\alpha$ , we have  $M \preceq N_\beta$ . But  $N_\beta$  is saturated in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ . So every type over  $M$  is realized in  $N_\beta$ .  $\dashv$

In Fact 2.19, Proposition 2.20 and Proposition 2.21, we do not have to assume Hypothesis 2.5, but only the following hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 2.18.*

- (1)  $(K, \preceq)$  is an AEC and
- (2)  $K, \preceq$  and  $S^{bs}$  satisfy Items (1) and (2) of Definition 2.1 (in particular,  $|S^{bs}(M)| \leq \lambda^+$  holds for every  $M$  of cardinality  $\lambda$ ).

The following fact is a restatement of [9, Theorem 2.5.8(2)]. It presents a way to construct a saturated model in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ . Since we use only basic types, this fact is not trivial.

**Fact 2.19.** *Suppose:*

- (1) *Hypothesis 2.18 holds,*
- (2)  *$\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  is an increasing continuous sequence of models of cardinality  $\lambda$  and*
- (3) *for every  $\alpha < \lambda^+$  and every basic type  $p$  over  $M_\alpha$ ,  $p$  is realized in some  $M_\beta$  with  $\alpha < \beta < \lambda^+$ .*

*Then  $\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda^+} M_\alpha$  is a saturated model in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ .*

**Proposition 2.20.** *Assume Hypothesis 2.18. Every model of cardinality  $\lambda$  can be extended to a saturated model in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M_0$  be a model of cardinality  $\lambda$ . We choose  $M_\alpha$  by induction on  $\alpha \in (0, \lambda^+)$ , such that the sequence  $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  satisfies Conditions (1) and (2) of Fact 2.19 (as in the proof of (2)  $\rightarrow$  (3) in [9, Theorem 2.5.8(2)]). By Fact 2.19,  $\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda^+} M_\alpha$  is saturated in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ .  $\dashv$

**Proposition 2.21.** *Assume Hypothesis 2.18. Every model of cardinality  $\lambda^+$  can be extended to a saturated model in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M_1 \in K_{\lambda^+}$ . Take a model  $M^- \in K$  of cardinality  $\lambda$ , such that  $M^- \preceq M_1$ . By Proposition 2.20, we can find a saturated model in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ ,  $M_2$  with  $M^- \preceq M_2$ . By [14, Lemma II.1.14 (saturativity=model homogeneity)], there is an embedding  $f$  of  $M_1$  into  $M_2$  fixing  $M^-$  pointwise. So  $f[M_1] \preceq M_2$ . Since every AEC is closed under isomorphisms, we conclude that  $M_1$  can be extended to a saturated model in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ .  $\dashv$

**Remark 2.22.** By Proposition 10.3, for every two types  $p, q$  over a saturated model in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ ,  $p = q$  in the context of  $(K, \preceq)$  if and only if  $p = q$  in the context of  $(K^{sat}, \preceq)$ . We use it freely.

Proposition 2.23 is the analog of Proposition 2.14 for  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$ . A comparison shows that while in  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$ , we have always an AEC in  $\lambda^+$ , in  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$  we have always the joint embedding property.

**Proposition 2.23.** *Assume that  $(K^{sat}, \preceq \restriction K^{sat})$  is an AEC in  $\lambda^+$ . If  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$  satisfies Axioms 1.1 then it is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame minus amalgamation in  $\lambda^+$ .*

*Proof.* By Fact 2.12 and Proposition 2.21,  $K^{sat}$  has no maximal model. Since  $K^{sat}$  satisfies categoricity, it satisfies the joint embedding property. By Fact 2.13 (and Remark 2.22),  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$  satisfies the density, monotonicity, local character and continuity axioms.  $\dashv$

**Proposition 2.24.** *Assume that  $(K^{sat}, \preceq \restriction K^{sat})$  is an AEC in  $\lambda^+$ . If  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame then  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame.*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame, the amalgamation in  $\lambda^+$  property holds. In particular, every saturated model in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$  is an amalgamation base. By Proposition 2.21, it is an amalgamation base in the sense of  $K^{sat}$ .

Since  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame, it satisfies Axioms 1.1. Hence, by Remark 2.22, it is easy to prove that  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$  satisfies the extension, uniqueness and basic stability axioms.

$\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  satisfies the symmetry axiom and we have to prove that  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$  satisfies the symmetry axiom. Let  $M_0, M_1, M_2$  be saturated models in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ , such that  $M_0 \preceq M_1 \preceq M_2$ . Let  $a \in M_1 - M_0$  such that  $tp(a, M_0, M_1)$  is basic. Let  $b \in M_2 - M_1$  such that  $tp(b, M_1, M_2)$  does not fork over  $M_0$ . Since  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  satisfies the symmetry axiom, we can find  $M'_2$  and  $M_3$  of cardinality  $\lambda^+$  such that the following hold:

- (1)  $M_0 \preceq M'_2 \preceq M_3$ ,
- (2)  $M_2 \preceq M_3$ ,
- (3)  $b \in M'_2$  and
- (4)  $tp(a, M'_2, M_3)$  does not fork over  $M_0$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 M_4 & \xrightarrow{f} & M_5 & \xrightarrow{id} & M_6 \\
 \uparrow id & & \uparrow id & & \\
 b \in M'_2 & \xrightarrow{id} & M_3 \ni a & & \\
 \uparrow id & & \uparrow id & & \\
 M_0 & \xrightarrow{id} & a \in M_1 & \xrightarrow{id} & M_2 \ni b
 \end{array}$$

It is not necessarily that the models  $M'_2$  and  $M_3$  are saturated in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ . But by Proposition 2.21, there is a model  $M_4 \in K^{sat}$  such that  $M'_2 \preceq M_4$ . Since  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  satisfies the extension axiom, we can find an amalgamation  $(id_{M_3}, f, M_5)$  of  $M_3$  and  $M_4$  over  $M'_2$  (in particular,  $f(b) = a$ ), such that  $tp(a, f[M_4], M_5)$  does not fork over  $M'_2$ . Since  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  satisfies [9, Proposition

2.5.6 (the transitivity proposition)],  $tp(a, f[M_4], M_5)$  does not fork over  $M_0$ . By Proposition 2.21, we can find a model  $M_6 \in K^{sat}$  such that  $M_5 \preceq M_6$ .

We have the following:

- (1)  $f[M_4]$  and  $M_6$  are saturated in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ ,
- (2)  $M_0 \preceq f[M_4] \preceq M_6$ ,
- (3)  $M_2 \preceq M_6$ ,
- (4)  $b \in f[M_4]$  and
- (5)  $tp(a, f[M_4], M_6)$  does not fork over  $M_0$ .

The proof of the symmetry axiom is completed. Now by Proposition 2.23,  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame.  $\dashv$

If the amalgamation property in  $\lambda^+$  does not hold then  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  is not a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame. In [9], we replace the relation  $\preceq \upharpoonright K_{\lambda^+}$  by  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$ , so the amalgamation property in  $\lambda^+$  holds (this is Shelah's approach). The good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame that is constructed in [9] is called  $\mathfrak{s}^+$ . The theorems in [14].III relate to  $\mathfrak{s}^+$  and most of them are unknown for  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$ . For example, the existence of primeness triples is proved in  $\mathfrak{s}^+$  (see [12]), but unknown for  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$ , even if it is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame.

But in our main results, we present cases, where the relations  $\preceq \upharpoonright K_{\lambda^+}$  and  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  coincide. So we have the advantages of  $\preceq$  and of  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$ . In particular, our results enable to apply the results and methods of [14].III.

### 3. VARIANTS OF TAMENESS

Given that it is not clear how to define tameness in three aspects of our context, we could offer  $2^3 = 8$  variants of tameness. Actually, we study five variants. In order to clarify the first aspect, we recall known facts about the connection between the amalgamation property and the definition of galois-types (due to Shelah). Note that since all the types in this paper are galois-types, we call them types, omitting 'galois'. The following definition of types sums up [9, Definitions 1.0.22 and 1.0.24]:

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $M_0, M_1, M_2$  be models in  $K$  and let  $a_1 \in M_1 - M_0$  and  $a_2 \in M_2 - M_0$ . We say that  $(M_0, M_1, a_1)E^*(M_0, M_2, a_2)$  when there is an amalgamation  $(f_1, f_2, M_3)$  of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  over  $M_0$  such that  $f_1(a_1) = f_2(a_2)$ . We define  $E$  as the transitive closure of  $E^*$ .  $tp(a_1, M_0, M_1) = tp(a_2, M_0, M_2)$  if and only if  $(M_0, M_1, a_1)E(M_0, M_2, a_2)$ .

$(M_0, M_1, a_1)E^*(M_0, M_2, a_2)$  says that ' $a_1$  and  $a_2$  strongly realize the same type over  $M_0$  (in the definitions of [1]). When the amalgamation property in  $\lambda$  holds, the restriction of  $E^*$  to models of cardinality  $\lambda$  is a transitive partial order, so if  $\|M_0\| = \lambda$  then  $tp(a_1, M_0, M_1) = tp(a_2, M_0, M_2)$  if and only if the triples  $(M_0, M_1, a_1)$  and  $(M_0, M_2, a_2)$  are  $E^*$ -equivalent.

**Definition 3.2.**  $(K, \preceq)$  is said to satisfy the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness property when for every  $M_0, M_1, M_2 \in K_{\lambda^+}$  with  $M_0 \preceq M_1$  and  $M_0 \preceq M_2$ , the following condition holds: For every  $a_1 \in M_1 - M_0$  and  $a_2 \in M_2 - M_0$ , if for

every  $M_0^- \in K_\lambda$  with  $M_0^- \preceq M_0$ , we have  $tp(a_1, M_0^-, M_1) = tp(a_2, M_0^-, M_2)$  then  $(M_0, M_1, a_1)E^*(M_0, M_2, a_2)$ .

**Remark 3.3.** Obviously, if the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness property and the amalgamation property in  $\lambda^+$  hold then the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness property holds.

In the following definition, the quantifier of  $M_0^-$  is ‘for some’ in place of ‘for every’. But see Proposition 3.5.

**Definition 3.4.**  $(K, \preceq)$  is said to satisfy the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types property when for every  $M_0, M_1, M_2 \in K_{\lambda^+}$  with  $M_0 \preceq M_1$  and  $M_0 \preceq M_2$ , the following condition holds: For every  $a_1 \in M_1 - M_0$  and  $a_2 \in M_2 - M_0$ , if for some  $M_0^- \in K_\lambda$  with  $M_0^- \preceq M_0$ , we have  $tp(a_1, M_0^-, M_1) = tp(a_2, M_0^-, M_2)$  and the types  $tp(a_1, M_0, M_1)$  and  $tp(a_2, M_0, M_2)$  do not fork over  $M_0^-$  then  $(M_0, M_1, a_1)E^*(M_0, M_2, a_2)$ .

[Definition 3.4 is similar to the uniqueness property in a semi-good non-forking frame. But the models are not of the same cardinality: while  $\|M_0^-\| = \lambda$ ,  $\|M_0\| = \lambda^+$ ].

**Proposition 3.5.** If  $(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness property, then it satisfies the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types property.

The proof of Proposition 3.5 is rather easy, but for completeness we give it.

*Proof.* Let  $M_0, M_1, M_2 \in K_{\lambda^+}$  such that  $M_0 \preceq M_1$  and  $M_0 \preceq M_2$ . Let  $a_1 \in M_1 - M_0$  and  $a_2 \in M_2 - M_0$  be given. Assume that for some  $M_0^- \in K_\lambda$  with  $M_0^- \preceq M_0$ , we have  $tp(a_1, M_0^-, M_1) = tp(a_2, M_0^-, M_2)$  and the types  $tp(a_1, M_0, M_1)$  and  $tp(a_2, M_0, M_2)$  do not fork over  $M_0^-$ . We should prove that  $(M_0, M_1, a_1)E^*(M_0, M_2, a_2)$ .

Since  $(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness property, it is sufficient to prove that for every  $M^* \in K_\lambda$  with  $M^* \preceq M_0$ , we have  $tp(a_1, M^*, M_1) = tp(a_2, M^*, M_2)$  (by Definition 3.2, where  $M^*$  stands for the  $M_0^-$ ).

Since  $LST(K, \preceq) \leq \lambda$ , we can find  $N \in K_\lambda$  satisfying  $M_0^- \cup M^* \subseteq N \preceq M_0$ . Clearly,  $M_0^- \preceq N$  and  $M^* \preceq N$ . Since the types  $tp(a_1, M_0, M_1)$  and  $tp(a_2, M_0, M_2)$  do not fork over  $M_0^-$ , the types  $tp(a_1, N, M_1)$  and  $tp(a_2, N, M_2)$  do not fork over  $M_0^-$ . So by uniqueness of non-forking,  $tp(a_1, N, M_1) = tp(a_2, N, M_2)$ . So  $tp(a_1, M^*, M_1) = tp(a_2, M^*, M_2)$ .  $\dashv$

**Definition 3.6.** The  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types property is similar to the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types property, but we conclude only  $tp(a_1, M_0, M_1) = tp(a_2, M_0, M_2)$ .

**Remark 3.7.** Obviously, if the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types property and the amalgamation property in  $\lambda^+$  hold then the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types property holds.

Proposition 3.9 is the converse of Remark 3.7. Claim 3.8 is a preparation for Proposition 3.9.

**Claim 3.8.** *Suppose that the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non forking types property holds. Then for every two models  $N_0, N_1 \in K_{\lambda^+}$  with  $N_0 \preceq N_1$  and every two elements  $a, b \in N_1 - N_0$ , if  $tp(a, N_0, N_1) = tp(b, N_0, N_1)$  and it is basic then  $(N_0, N_1, a)E^*(N_0, N_1, b)$ .*

*Proof.* Take a model  $M$  of cardinality  $\lambda$  such that the type  $tp(a, N_0, N_1)$  does not fork over  $M$ . Clearly,  $tp(a, M, N_1) = tp(b, M, N_1)$ . So by strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types,  $(N_0, N_1, a)E^*(N_0, N_1, b)$ .  $\dashv$

The following proposition is due to Boney.<sup>3</sup>

**Proposition 3.9.** *Assume that the amalgamation property in  $\lambda$  holds. Then the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types property yields the amalgamation property in  $\lambda^+$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $N_0, N_1, N_2$  be models in  $K$  of cardinality  $\lambda^+$  such that  $N_0 \prec N_1$  and  $N_0 \prec N_2$ . We should find an amalgamation of  $N_1$  and  $N_2$  over  $N_0$ . Take an element  $a \in N_1 - N_0$  such that  $p := tp(a, N_0, N_1)$  is basic. Take a non-forking extension  $q \in S^{bs}(N_2)$  of  $p$ . Take a model  $N_3$  and an element  $b \in N_3$  such that  $N_2 \preceq N_3$  and  $tp(b, N_2, N_3) = q$ . But  $q \upharpoonright N_0 = p$ . So by Claim 3.8,  $(N_0, N_3, b)E^*(N_0, N_1, a)$ . Hence, there is an amalgamation  $(f, g, N_4)$  of  $N_3$  and  $N_1$  over  $N_0$ . So  $(f \upharpoonright N_2, g, N_4)$  is an amalgamation of  $N_2$  and  $N_1$  over  $N_0$ .  $\dashv$

**Proposition 3.10.** *Assume that the amalgamation property in  $\lambda$  holds. Strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types is equivalent to the conjunction of amalgamation in  $\lambda^+$  and  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types.*

*Proof.* By Remark 3.7 and Proposition 3.9.  $\dashv$

In all the variants of tameness appearing below, adding the word ‘strong’ is equivalent to assuming that every ‘relevant’ model in  $\lambda^+$  is an amalgamation base.

The following proposition is an analog of Proposition 3.9.

**Proposition 3.11.** *Assume that the amalgamation property in  $\lambda$  holds. Then the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness property yields the amalgamation property in  $\lambda^+$ .*

*Proof.* By Propositions 3.5 and 3.9.  $\dashv$

The following proposition is an analog of Proposition 3.10.

**Proposition 3.12.** *Assume that the amalgamation property in  $\lambda$  holds. Strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness is equivalent to the conjunction of amalgamation in  $\lambda^+$  and  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness.*

---

<sup>3</sup>in a private communication, during the ICM (International Congress of Mathematicians) 2014 satellite meeting on Classification theory and its applications on Seoul, Korea

*Proof.* Mainly, by Proposition 3.11.  $\dashv$

The saturated models in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$  are natural candidates for base amalgamations: If we restrict ourselves to the saturated models in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$  then we have categoricity in  $\lambda^+$  [9, Theorem 1.0.32]. By a well-known theorem of Shelah, if an AEC is categorical in  $\lambda^+$  but does not satisfy the amalgamation property in  $\lambda^+$  then under plausible set theoretic assumptions, we can prove the existence of  $2^{\lambda^{++}}$  models of cardinality  $\lambda^{++}$ . So it is natural to assume that every saturated model in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$  is an amalgamation base. This leads to the next definition.

**Definition 3.13.**  $(K, \preceq)$  is said to satisfy *the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models property* when for every  $M_0, M_1, M_2$  of cardinality  $\lambda^+$  such that  $M_0$  is saturated in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ ,  $M_0 \preceq M_1$  and  $M_0 \preceq M_2$  the condition in Definition 3.6 holds.

**Definition 3.14.** The strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models is defined as expected.

The proof of Proposition 3.15 is easy. We apply Proposition 3.15 in the proof of Theorem 7.15.

**Proposition 3.15.** *Suppose:*

- (1) *the amalgamation property in  $\lambda$  holds,*
- (2) *Every saturated model in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$  is an amalgamation base and*
- (3) *the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models property.*

*Then the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models property holds.*

Proposition 3.16 is an analog of Proposition 3.10.

**Proposition 3.16.** *Assume that the amalgamation property in  $\lambda$  holds. Then the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models property is equivalent to the conjunction of the following two properties:*

- (1) *Every saturated model in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$  is an amalgamation base and*
- (2) *the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models property.*

*Proof.* Similar to the proof of Proposition 3.10.  $\dashv$

**Remark 3.17.** In Proposition 3.16, we may omit the words ‘non-forking’ (appearing twice).

#### 4. DERIVING NON-FORKING FRAMES USING TAMENESS

**Theorem 4.1.** *Suppose:*

- (1)  *$\mathfrak{s}$  is a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame,*
- (2) *the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types holds and*
- (3)  *$\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  satisfies symmetry.*

Then  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame minus the joint embedding and amalgamation properties.

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.14 and Claims 4.3, 4.6 and 4.8. Note that these claims are not new: similar claims appear in [9]. But for completeness, we give their proofs.  $\dashv$

Theorem 4.2 is the analog of Theorem 4.1 for  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$ .

**Theorem 4.2.** *Suppose:*

- (1)  $\mathfrak{s}$  is a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame,
- (2)  $(K^{sat}, \preceq \upharpoonright K^{sat})$  is an AEC,
- (3) the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models holds and
- (4)  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$  satisfies symmetry.

Then  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame minus amalgamation in  $\lambda^+$ .

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.23 and Claims 4.4, 4.7 and 4.9.  $\dashv$

**Claim 4.3.** *Assume that the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types holds. Then  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  satisfies uniqueness.*

*Proof.* Let  $N_0, N_1$  be two models in  $K$  of cardinality  $\lambda^+$  with  $N_0 \preceq N_1$ . Let  $p, q$  be two types over  $N_1$  which do not fork over  $N_0$ , such that  $p \upharpoonright N_0 = q \upharpoonright N_0$ . We should prove that  $p = q$ . Let  $M_p, M_q$  be models in  $K$  of cardinality  $\lambda$  such that  $M_p \preceq N_0$ ,  $M_q \preceq N_0$  and the types  $p \upharpoonright N_0, q \upharpoonright N_0$  do not fork over  $M_p, M_q$  respectively. Since  $LST(K, \preceq) \leq \lambda$ , we can find a model  $M$  in  $K$  of cardinality  $\lambda$  such that  $M_p \cup M_q \subseteq M \preceq N_0$ . So  $M_p \preceq M$  and  $M_q \preceq M$ . Therefore by monotonicity, the types  $p \upharpoonright N_0$  and  $q \upharpoonright N_0$  do not fork over  $M$ . Hence, by transitivity, the types  $p$  and  $q$  do not fork over  $M$ . Since  $p \upharpoonright M = q \upharpoonright M$ , by  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types, we have  $p = q$ .  $\dashv$

**Claim 4.4.** *Assume that the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models holds. Then  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$  satisfies uniqueness.*

*Proof.* By the proof of Claim 4.3.  $\dashv$

The following claim is a preparation for extension. Note that it holds even without any remnant of tameness.

**Claim 4.5.** *If  $M$  is a model of cardinality  $\lambda$ ,  $N$  is a model of cardinality  $\lambda^+$ ,  $M \preceq N$  and  $p \in S^{bs}(M)$  then there is a non-forking extension of  $p$  to a type over  $N$ .*

*Proof.* Take a filtration  $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  of  $N$  with  $M_0 = M$ . Let  $N_0$  be a model of cardinality  $\lambda$  such that  $M_0 \preceq N_0$  and for some  $a \in N_0 - M_0$   $tp(a, M_0, N_0) = p$ . We choose by induction on  $\alpha < \lambda^+$  a model  $N_\alpha$  and an embedding  $f_\alpha : M_\alpha \rightarrow N_\alpha$  such that:

- (1)  $f_0$  is the identity from  $M$  to  $N_0$ ,

- (2) if  $\alpha = \beta + 1$  then  $f_\beta \subseteq f_\alpha$  and  $tp(a, f_\alpha[M_\alpha], N_\alpha)$  does not fork over  $f_\beta[M_\beta]$  (it is possible by the extension property in  $\mathfrak{s}$ ) and
- (3) if  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal then  $N_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} N_\beta$  and  $f_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} f_\beta$ .

We can prove by induction on  $\alpha < \lambda^+$ , that  $tp(a, f_\alpha[M_\alpha], N_\alpha)$  does not fork over  $M$ : Assume that  $tp(a, f_\beta[M_\beta], N_\beta)$  does not fork over  $M$  for every  $\beta < \alpha$ . We have to prove that it holds for  $\alpha$ . If  $\alpha = 0$  then it holds by definition. If  $\alpha = \beta + 1$  for some  $\beta$  then by Clause (2),  $tp(a, f_\alpha[M_\alpha], N_\alpha)$  does not fork over  $f_\beta[M_\beta]$ . So by transitivity (in  $\mathfrak{s}$ ),  $tp(a, f_\alpha[M_\alpha], N_\alpha)$  does not fork over  $M$ . If  $\alpha$  is limit then it holds by continuity (in  $\mathfrak{s}$ ).

Define  $N_{\lambda^+} =: \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda^+} N_\alpha$  and  $f =: \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda^+} f_\alpha$ . Since  $\mathbb{U}$  is closed under isomorphisms, it is sufficient to prove that  $tp(a, f[N], N_{\lambda^+})$  does not fork over  $M$ . Let  $M'$  be a model of cardinality  $\lambda$  with  $M \preceq M' \preceq f[N]$ . For some  $\alpha < \lambda^+$ , we have  $M' \subseteq f[M_\alpha]$ . But  $tp(a, f[M_\alpha], f[N])$  does not fork over  $M$ . So by monotonicity,  $tp(a, M', f[N])$  does not fork over  $M$ .  $\dashv$

**Claim 4.6.** *Assume that the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types holds. Then  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  satisfies extension.*

*Proof.* Let  $M, N$  be models in  $K$  of cardinality  $\lambda^+$  with  $M \prec N$ . Let  $p$  be a basic type over  $M$ . We should find a type over  $N$ , extending  $p$ , that does not fork over  $M$ . Since  $p$  is basic, there is a model  $M_0$  of cardinality  $\lambda$  such that  $M_0 \preceq M$  and  $p$  does not fork over  $M_0$ . By Claim 4.5, there is a basic type  $q$  over  $N$ , extending  $p \upharpoonright M_0$  such that  $q$  does not fork over  $M_0$ . By monotonicity,  $q$  does not fork over  $M$  and  $q \upharpoonright M$  does not fork over  $M_0$ . So by tameness for non-forking types,  $q \upharpoonright M = p$ . Hence,  $q$  is a non-forking extension of  $p$  to  $N$ .  $\dashv$

**Claim 4.7.** *Assume that the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models holds. Then  $\mathfrak{s}^{\text{sat}}$  satisfies extension.*

*Proof.* By the proof of Claim 4.6.  $\dashv$

**Claim 4.8.** *Assume that the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types holds. Then  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  satisfies basic stability.*

There is no significant difference between the following proof and the proof of [9, Proposition 10.1.10].

*Proof.* By basic stability in  $\mathfrak{s}$  and  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types. We elaborate: Let  $N$  be a model in  $K$  of cardinality  $\lambda^+$ . We should prove that the number of basic types over  $N$  is  $\lambda^+$  at most. Let  $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  be a filtration of  $N$ . For every basic type  $p$  over  $N$  we define  $\alpha_p$  as the minimal ordinal  $\alpha < \lambda^+$  such that  $p$  does not fork over  $M_\alpha$ . We define  $q_p := p \upharpoonright M_{\alpha_p}$ . By basic almost stability (in  $\mathfrak{s}$ ),  $\|S^{\text{bs}}(M_\alpha)\| \leq \lambda^+$ . So  $|\{(\alpha_p, q_p) : p \text{ is a basic type over } N\}| \leq \lambda^+ \times \lambda^+ = \lambda^+$ . So it is sufficient to prove that the function  $p \rightarrow (\alpha_p, q_p)$  is an injection. Let  $p_1, p_2$  be two basic types over  $N$  such that  $\alpha_{p_1} = \alpha_{p_2}$  and  $q_{p_1} = q_{p_2}$ . Denote  $\alpha := \alpha_{p_1}$ . The types  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  do not fork over  $\alpha$ . But  $p_1 \upharpoonright M_\alpha = q_{p_1} = q_{p_2} = p_2 \upharpoonright M_\alpha$ . Hence, by  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types,  $p_1 = p_2$ .  $\dashv$

**Claim 4.9.** *Assume that the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models holds. Then  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$  satisfies basic stability.*

*Proof.* By the proof of Claim 4.8. ⊣

## 5. CONTINUITY YIELDS SYMMETRY

We generalize a bit the definition of independence [13, Definition 3.2]: here, we do not limit the cardinalities of the models and of the set  $J$ .

**Definition 5.1.** Let  $\alpha^*$  be an ordinal.

(a)  $\langle M_\alpha, a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle \frown \langle M_{\alpha^*} \rangle$  is said to be *independent* over  $M$  when:

- (1)  $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \leq \alpha^* \rangle$  is an increasing continuous sequence of models in  $K$ .
- (2)  $M \preceq M_0$ .
- (3) For every  $\alpha < \alpha^*$ ,  $a_\alpha \in M_{\alpha+1} - M_\alpha$  and the type  $tp(a_\alpha, M_\alpha, M_{\alpha+1})$  does not fork over  $M$ .

(b)  $\langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$  is said to be *independent* in  $(M, M_0, N)$  when  $M \preceq M_0 \preceq N$ ,  $\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^*\} \subseteq N - M$  and for some increasing continuous sequence  $\langle M_\alpha : 0 < \alpha \leq \alpha^* \rangle$  and a model  $N^+$  the sequence  $\langle M_\alpha, a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle \frown \langle M_{\alpha^*} \rangle$  is independent over  $M$ ,  $N \preceq N^+$  and  $M_{\alpha^*} \preceq N^+$ .

(c)  $\langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$  is said to be  $K^{sat}$ -*independent* in  $(M, M_0, N)$ , when in addition, the models  $M, N$  and  $M_\alpha$  for each  $\alpha < \alpha^*$  are in  $K^{sat}$ .

(d) When  $M = M_0$ , we may omit it.

Using the independence terminology, we present two reformulations of symmetry:

**Remark 5.2.** The following are equivalent:

- (1)  $\mathfrak{s}$  satisfies the symmetry axiom.
- (2) For every  $M, N \in K_\lambda$  with  $M \preceq N$  and for every two elements  $a, b \in N$  the sequence  $\langle a, b \rangle$  is independent in  $(M, N)$  if and only if the sequence  $\langle b, a \rangle$  is independent in  $(M, N)$ .
- (3) For every  $M_0, M_1, M_2 \in K_\lambda$  with  $M_0 \preceq M_1 \preceq M_2$  and for every two elements  $a_0, a_1 \in M_2$  if  $tp(a_0, M_0, M_1)$  is basic and  $tp(a_1, M_1, M_2)$  does not fork over  $M_0$  then the sequence  $\langle a_1, a_0 \rangle$  is independent in  $(M_0, M_2)$ .

**Definition 5.3.** Let  $\beta^* < \lambda^+$ .

(1) The  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -*continuity of independence of sequences of length  $\beta^*$  property* is the following property: Let  $M \in K_{\lambda^+}$ ,  $M \preceq N \in K_{\lambda^+}$  and let  $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  be a filtration of  $M$ . If  $\langle a_\beta : \beta < \beta^* \rangle$  is independent in  $(M_\alpha, N)$  for each  $\alpha < \lambda^+$  then it is independent in  $(M, N)$ .

(2) The  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -*continuity of serial independence property* means the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -continuity of independence of sequences of length  $\beta^*$  property for every  $\beta^* < \lambda^+$ .

(3) if we say in (1) or (2)  $K^{sat}$ -independence then independent is replaced by  $K^{sat}$ -independent.

**Theorem 5.4.** *Suppose:*

- (1)  $\mathfrak{s}$  is a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame,
- (2) the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types property holds, and
- (3) the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -continuity of independence of sequences of length 2 property holds.

Then  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame minus the joint embedding and amalgamation properties.

*Proof.* By Proposition 5.6,  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  satisfies the symmetry axiom. So by Theorem 4.1,  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame minus amalgamation in  $\lambda^+$ .  $\dashv$

Theorem 5.5 is the analog of Theorem 5.4 for  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$ .

**Theorem 5.5.** *Suppose:*

- (1)  $\mathfrak{s}$  is a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame,
- (2)  $(K^{sat}, \preceq \upharpoonright K^{sat})$  is an AEC in  $\lambda^+$ ,
- (3) the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$  property holds and
- (4) the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -continuity of  $K^{sat}$ -independence of sequences of length 2 property holds.

Then  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame minus amalgamation in  $\lambda^+$ .

*Proof.* By the proof of Proposition 5.6, the symmetry axiom holds. So by Theorem 4.2,  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame minus amalgamation in  $\lambda^+$ .  $\dashv$

**Proposition 5.6.** *If the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -continuity of independence of sequences of length 2 property holds then  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  satisfies the symmetry axiom.*

*Proof.*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 a_1 \in M_{2,0} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{2,\alpha} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{2,\alpha+1} & \xrightarrow{id} & N_2 \ni a_1 \\
 \uparrow id & & \uparrow id & & \uparrow id & & \uparrow id \\
 a_0 \in M_{1,0} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{1,\alpha} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{1,\alpha+1} & \xrightarrow{id} & N_1 \ni a_0 \\
 \uparrow id & & \uparrow id & & \uparrow id & & \uparrow id \\
 M_{0,0} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{0,\alpha} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{0,\alpha+1} & \xrightarrow{id} & N_0
 \end{array}$$

Let  $N_0, N_1, N_2$  be three models in  $K$  of cardinality  $\lambda^+$ . Let  $a_0$  be an element in  $N_1 - N_0$  and let  $a_1$  be an element in  $N_2 - N_1$ . Suppose  $tp(a_0, N_0, N_1)$  is basic and  $tp(a_1, N_1, N_2)$  does not fork over  $N_0$ . By Remark 5.2(3  $\rightarrow$  1), it is sufficient to prove that the sequence  $\langle a_1, a_0 \rangle$  is independent in  $(N_0, N_2)$ . Let  $\langle M_{0,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ ,  $\langle M_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ ,  $\langle M_{2,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  be filtrations of  $N_0, N_1, N_2$  respectively, such that  $a_0 \in M_{1,0}$  and  $a_1 \in M_{2,0}$ . For some club  $E$  of  $\lambda^+$ , for every  $\alpha \in E$ , we have  $M_{0,\alpha} \preceq M_{1,\alpha} \preceq M_{2,\alpha}$ . By renaming, without loss of generality, it holds for  $E = \lambda^+$ .

For some  $\alpha_0 < \lambda^+$  the type  $tp(a_0, N_0, N_1)$  does not fork over  $M_{0,\alpha_0}$ . Similarly, for some  $\alpha_1 < \lambda^+$  the type  $tp(a_1, N_1, N_2)$  does not fork over  $M_{0,\alpha_1}$ . Define  $\alpha^* =: \max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ . By monotonicity,  $tp(a_0, N_0, N_1)$  does not fork over  $M_{0,\alpha^*}$  and  $tp(a_1, N_1, N_2)$  does not fork over  $M_{0,\alpha^*}$ . By renaming, without loss of generality  $\alpha^* = 0$ . Let  $\alpha < \lambda^+$ . By monotonicity,  $tp(a_0, M_{0,\alpha}, M_{1,\alpha})$  is basic and  $tp(a_1, M_{1,\alpha}, M_{2,\alpha})$  does not fork over  $M_{0,\alpha}$ . So  $\langle a_0, a_1 \rangle$  is independent in  $(M_{0,\alpha}, N_2)$ . Since  $\mathfrak{s}$  satisfies the symmetry axiom, by Remark 5.2(1  $\rightarrow$  2), the sequence  $\langle a_1, a_0 \rangle$  is independent in  $(M_{0,\alpha}, N_2)$  (for every  $\alpha < \lambda^+$ ). Hence, by  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -continuity of sequences of length 2, the sequence  $\langle a_1, a_0 \rangle$  is independent in  $(N_0, N_2)$ .  $\dashv$

## 6. THE RELATION $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$

The main point in Shelah's approach is to construct a relation,  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$ , on  $K_{\lambda^+}$ , such that  $(K_{\lambda^+}, \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF})$  satisfies the amalgamation property. The construction of  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  is done by the following steps:

- (1) Assume that the class of uniqueness triples,  $K^{3,uq}$ , satisfies the existence property,
- (2) use  $K^{3,uq}$  to construct a non-forking relation,  $NF$ , on quadruples of models of cardinality  $\lambda$ ,
- (3) use  $NF$  to construct a non-forking relation,  $\widehat{NF}$  on quadruples of models: two of cardinality  $\lambda$  and two of cardinality  $\lambda^+$ ,
- (4) use  $\widehat{NF}$  to construct a binary relation,  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  on  $K_{\lambda^+}$ .

In this section, we define  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  and present its basic properties.

In Definition 6.1, we list the axioms for a relation  $NF$  for a model of size  $\lambda$  is independent from a model of size  $\lambda$  over a model of size  $\lambda$  in a model of size  $\lambda$ . We denote 'the relation  $NF$  satisfies the list of the axioms' by  $\otimes_{NF}$ . Fact 6.4 presents sufficient conditions for the existence of a relation  $NF$  for which  $\otimes_{NF}$  holds and respecting  $\mathfrak{s}$ .

**Definition 6.1.** Let  $NF \subseteq {}^4K_\lambda$ .  $\otimes_{NF}$  means that the following hold:

- (a) If  $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$  then for each  $n \in \{1, 2\}$   $M_0 \leq M_n \leq M_3$  and  $M_1 \cap M_2 = M_0$ .
- (b) Monotonicity: if  $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ ,  $N_0 = M_0$  and for each  $n < 3$   $N_n \leq M_n \wedge N_0 \leq N_n \leq N_3$ ,  $(\exists N^*)[M_3 \leq N^* \wedge N_3 \leq N^*]$  then  $NF(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3)$ .
- (c) Extension: For every  $N_0, N_1, N_2 \in K_\lambda$ , if for each  $l \in \{1, 2\}$   $N_0 \leq N_l$  and  $N_1 \cap N_2 = N_0$ , then for some  $N_3 \in K_\lambda$ ,  $NF(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3)$ .
- (d) Weak Uniqueness: Suppose for  $x = a, b$ ,  $NF(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3^x)$ . Then there is a joint embedding of  $N^a, N^b$  over  $N_1 \cup N_2$ .
- (e) Symmetry: For every  $N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3 \in K_\lambda$ ,  $NF(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3) \Leftrightarrow NF(N_0, N_2, N_1, N_3)$ .
- (f) Long transitivity: For  $x = a, b$ , let  $\langle M_{x,i} : i \leq \alpha^* \rangle$  an increasing continuous sequence of models in  $K_\lambda$ . Suppose that for each  $i < \alpha^*$ ,  $NF(M_{a,i}, M_{a,i+1}, M_{b,i}, M_{b,i+1})$ . Then  $NF(M_{a,0}, M_{a,\alpha^*}, M_{b,0}, M_{b,\alpha^*})$ .

- (g)  $NF$  is closed under isomorphisms: if  $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$  and  $f : M_3 \rightarrow N_3$  is an isomorphism then  $NF(f[M_0], f[M_1], f[M_2], f[M_3])$ .

The next two definitions are needed in order to state Fact 6.4.

**Definition 6.2.** Let  $NF$  be a relation such that  $\bigotimes_{NF}$  holds. The relation  $NF$  respects the frame  $\mathfrak{s}$  means that if  $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ ,  $a \in M_1 - M_0$  and  $tp(a, M_0, M_1)$  is basic then  $tp(a, M_2, M_3)$  does not fork over  $M_0$ .

**Definition 6.3.** Let  $\mathfrak{s}$  be a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame.  $\mathfrak{s}$  is said to satisfy the *conjugation* property when  $K$  is categorical in  $\lambda$  in the following strong sense: for every  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  of cardinality  $\lambda$  and types  $p_1 \in S^{bs}(M_1)$  and  $p_2 \in S^{bs}(M_2)$ , if  $M_1 \preceq M_2$  and  $p_2$  is the non-forking extension of  $p_1$  then there is an isomorphism  $f : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$  such that  $f(p_1) = p_2$ .

By [9, Theorem 5.5.4] (and [9, Definitions 5.2.1, 5.2.6]):

**Fact 6.4.** *If the class of uniqueness triples satisfies the existence property and  $\mathfrak{s}$  satisfies the conjugation property (see [9, Definition 2.5.5]) then there is a (unique) relation  $NF \subseteq {}^4K_\lambda$  for which  $\bigotimes_{NF}$  holds and  $NF$  respects the frame  $\mathfrak{s}$ .*

From now on we assume:

*Hypothesis 6.5.*

- (1)  $K$  is categorical in  $\lambda$ ,
- (2)  $\mathfrak{s}$  is a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame,
- (3)  $\mathfrak{s}$  satisfies the conjugation property and
- (4) the class of uniqueness triples satisfies the existence property.

In Definition 6.6, we use the relation  $NF$  to present a relation for: a model of size  $\lambda$  is independent from a model of size  $\lambda^+$  over a model of size  $\lambda$  in a model of size  $\lambda^+$ .

**Definition 6.6.** Define a 4-ary relation  $\widehat{NF}$  on  $K$  by

$$\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$$

when the following hold:

- (1)  $N_0, N_1$  are of cardinality  $\lambda$ ,
- (2)  $M_0, M_1$  are of cardinality  $\lambda^+$ ,
- (3) There are filtrations  $\langle N_{0,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ ,  $\langle N_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  of  $M_0, M_1$  respectively, such that  $N_{0,0} = N_0$ ,  $N_{1,0} = N_1$  and for every  $\alpha < \lambda^+$  we have  $NF(N_{0,\alpha}, N_{1,\alpha}, N_{0,\alpha+1}, N_{1,\alpha+1})$ .

By [9, Theorem 6.1.3]:

**Fact 6.7** (basic properties of  $\widehat{NF}$ ).

- (a) *Disjointness:* If  $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$  then  $N_1 \cap M_0 = N_0$ .
- (b) *Monotonicity:* Suppose  $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$ ,  $N_0 \preceq N_1^* \preceq N_1$ ,  $N_1^* \cup M_0 \subseteq M_1^* \preceq M_1$  and  $M_1^* \in K_{\lambda^+}$ . Then  $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1^*, M_0, M_1^*)$ .

- (c) *Extension:* Suppose  $n < 2 \Rightarrow N_n \in K_\lambda$ ,  $M_0 \in K_{\lambda^+}$ ,  $N_0 \preceq N_1$ ,  $N_0 \preceq M_0$ ,  $N_1 \cap M_0 = N_0$ . Then there is a model  $M_1$  such that  $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$ .
- (d) *Weak Uniqueness:* If  $n < 2 \Rightarrow \widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_{1,n})$ , then there are  $M, f_0, f_1$  such that  $f_n$  is an embedding of  $M_{1,n}$  into  $M$  over  $N_1 \cup M_0$ .
- (e) *Respecting the frame:* Suppose  $\widehat{NF}(M_0, M_1, N_0, N_1)$  and  $tp(a, M_0, N_0) \in S^{bs}(M_0)$ . Then  $tp(a, M_1, N_1)$  does not fork over  $M_0$ .

Proposition 6.8 says roughly that ' $\widehat{NF}$  respects the frame  $\mathfrak{s}$ '. But Proposition 6.8 and Fact 6.7(e) are different (one might say that 'there is a symmetry between them'). In Proposition 8.4, we generalize Proposition 6.8, proving that the relation  $\widehat{NF}$  respects independence.

**Proposition 6.8.** *Suppose:*

- (1)  $M_0, M_1 \in K_\lambda$ ,
- (2)  $N_0, N_1 \in K_{\lambda^+}$ ,
- (3)  $\widehat{NF}(M_0, M_1, N_0, N_1)$ ,
- (4)  $a \in M_1 - M_0$ ,
- (5)  $tp(a, M_0, M_1)$  is basic.

Then  $tp(a, N_0, N_1)$  does not fork over  $M_0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $M' \in K_\lambda$  with  $M_0 \preceq M' \preceq N_0$ . We should prove that  $tp(a, M', N_1)$  does not fork over  $M_0$ . By the definition of  $\widehat{NF}$ , there are filtrations  $\langle M_{0,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  and  $\langle M_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  of  $N_0$  and  $N_1$  respectively, such that  $M_{0,0} = M_0$ ,  $M_{1,0} = M_1$  and  $NF(M_{0,\alpha}, M_{0,\alpha+1}, M_{1,\alpha}, M_{1,\alpha+1})$  holds for each  $\alpha < \lambda^+$ . Take  $\alpha < \lambda^+$  such that  $M' \subseteq M_{0,\alpha}$ . Since  $M' \preceq N_0$  and  $M_{0,\alpha} \preceq N_0$  we have  $M' \preceq M_{0,\alpha}$ . By long transitivity (Definition 6.1(f)),  $NF(M_{0,0}, M_{0,\alpha}, M_{1,0}, M_{1,\alpha})$ , namely,  $NF(M_0, M_{0,\alpha}, M_1, M_{1,\alpha})$ . So by monotonicity of  $NF$  (Definition 6.1(b)),  $NF(M_0, M', M_1, M_{1,\alpha})$ . Since the relation  $NF$  respects the frame  $\mathfrak{s}$ , it yields  $tp(a, M', N_1)$  does not fork over  $M_0$ .  $\dashv$

We now define a binary relation  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  on  $K_{\lambda^+}$ , that is based on the relation  $\widehat{NF}$ :

**Definition 6.9.** Suppose  $M_0, M_1 \in K_{\lambda^+}$ ,  $M_0 \preceq M_1$ . Then  $M_0 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_1$  means that  $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$  for some  $N_0, N_1 \in K_\lambda$ .

By [9, Proposition 6.1.6] and [9, Theorem 7.1.18(a)]:

**Fact 6.10.**  $(K_{\lambda^+}, \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF})$  satisfies the following properties:

- (a) Suppose  $M_0 \preceq M_1$ ,  $n < 2 \Rightarrow M_n \in K_{\lambda^+}$ . For  $n < 2$ , let  $\langle N_{n,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+ \rangle$  be a representation of  $M_n$ . Then  $M_0 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_1$  iff there is a club  $E \subseteq \lambda^+$  such that  $(\varepsilon < \zeta \wedge \{\varepsilon, \zeta\} \subseteq E) \Rightarrow NF(N_{0,\varepsilon}, N_{0,\zeta}, N_{1,\varepsilon}, N_{1,\zeta})$ .
- (b)  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  is a partial order.
- (c) If  $M_0 \preceq M_1 \preceq M_2$  and  $M_0 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_2$  then  $M_0 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_1$ .

- (d) If  $\delta \in \lambda^{+2}$  is a limit ordinal and  $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$  is a  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$ -increasing continuous sequence, then  $M_0 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha$ . Moreover, if  $M_\alpha \in K^{sat}$  for each  $\alpha < \delta$  then  $\bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha \in K^{sat}$ .
- (e)  $K_{\lambda^+}$  has no  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$ -maximal model.

**Proposition 6.11.** *Let  $M_1, M_2$  be models of cardinality  $\lambda^+$  with  $M_1 \preceq M_2$ . Then  $M_1 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_2$  if and only if for every two filtrations  $\langle M_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  and  $\langle M_{2,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  respectively, for some club  $E$  of  $\lambda^+$  for every  $\alpha \in E$  we have  $\widehat{NF}(M_{1,\alpha}, M_{2,\alpha}, M_1, M_2)$ .*

*Proof.* On the one hand, suppose  $M_1 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_2$ . Let  $\langle M_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  and  $\langle M_{2,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  be two filtrations of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  respectively. By Fact 6.10(a), for some club  $E$  of  $\lambda^+$ , for every  $\varepsilon, \zeta \in E$  if  $\varepsilon < \zeta$  then  $NF(M_{1,\varepsilon}, M_{1,\zeta}, M_{2,\varepsilon}, M_{2,\zeta})$ . Let  $\alpha \in E$ . Then the filtrations  $\langle M_{1,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \in E - \alpha \rangle$  and  $\langle M_{2,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \in E - \alpha \rangle$  witness that  $\widehat{NF}(M_{1,\alpha}, M_{2,\alpha}, M_1, M_2)$ .

Conversely, we have to prove that  $M_1 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_2$ . Take filtrations  $\langle M_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  and  $\langle M_{2,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  respectively. By assumption, for some club  $E$  of  $\lambda^+$  for every  $\alpha \in E$ , we have  $\widehat{NF}(M_{1,\alpha}, M_{2,\alpha}, M_1, M_2)$ . Take  $\alpha \in E$ . Since  $\widehat{NF}(M_{1,\alpha}, M_{2,\alpha}, M_1, M_2)$ , by Definition 6.9,  $M_1 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_2$ .  $\dashv$

## 7. ARE THE RELATIONS $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$ AND $\preceq \restriction K_{\lambda^+}$ EQUIVALENT?

The following question is open:

**Question 7.1.** *Let  $\mathfrak{s}$  be a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame. Suppose that  $(K_{\lambda^+}, \preceq \restriction K_{\lambda^+})$  satisfies the amalgamation property and the class of uniqueness triples satisfies the existence property. Given  $M, M^+ \in K_{\lambda^+}$ . Is Statement 7.2 true?*

*Statement 7.2.*

$$M \preceq M^+ \text{ if and only if } M \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M^+$$

Recall [12, Definition 4.7]:

**Definition 7.3.**  $\mathfrak{s}$  is said to be *successful semi-good<sup>+</sup>* when Statement 7.2 holds for every  $M, M^+ \in K^{sat}$ .

Here, in Theorem 7.15, we prove that  $\mathfrak{s}$  is successful semi-good<sup>+</sup> assuming amalgamation in  $\lambda^+$  and  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models. In Theorem 7.8, we prove Statement 7.2, for every  $M, M^+ \in K_{\lambda^+}$ , under a stronger assumption.

Before stating Theorem 7.8, we make several preparations. Fact 7.4 is a restatement of [9, Theorem 2.6.8.a].

**Fact 7.4.** *If  $N, N^+$  are models of cardinality  $\lambda$  at least with  $N \prec N^+$  then there is an element  $a \in N^+ - N$  such that  $tp(a, N, N^+)$  is basic.*

In Definition 7.5, we define a partial order  $(A, <_A)$ , which playing an important role in the proof of Theorem 7.8. In Propositions 7.6 and 7.7, we present two properties of this partial order.

**Definition 7.5.** Define  $A$  as the class of pairs,  $(M_1, M_1^+)$  of models of cardinality  $\lambda^+$  with  $M_1 \preceq M_1^+$ . Define a strict partial order,  $<_A$  on  $A$ , by:  $(M_1, M_1^+) <_A (M_2, M_2^+)$  when the following hold:

- (1)  $M_1 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_2$ ,
- (2)  $M_1^+ \preceq M_2^+$ ,
- (3)  $M_2 \cap M_1^+ \neq M_1$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M_2 & \xrightarrow{id} & M_2^+ \\ \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} \uparrow & & \uparrow id \\ M_1 & \xrightarrow{id} & M_1^+ \end{array}$$

**Proposition 7.6.** Assume that  $(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types property. Let  $(N, N^+) \in A$ . If  $(N, N^+)$  is  $<_A$ -maximal then  $N = N^+$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(N, N^+)$  be a pair in  $A$  with  $N \neq N^+$ . We should prove that  $(N, N^+)$  is not  $<_A$ -maximal. By Fact 7.4 (density of basic types over models of cardinality greater than  $\lambda$ ), for some  $a \in N^+ - N$  the type  $tp(a, N, N^+)$  is basic. So there is  $N^- \in K_\lambda$  such that  $N^- \preceq N$  and  $tp(a, N, N^+)$  does not fork over  $N^-$ . For some  $N_1^- \in K_\lambda$  and some  $b \in N_1^-$  we have  $tp(b, N^-, N_1^-) = tp(a, N^-, N^+)$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} b \in N_1^- & \xrightarrow{f} & N_1 & \xrightarrow{g} & N_1^+ \\ id \uparrow & & \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} \uparrow & & \uparrow id \\ N^- & \xrightarrow{id} & N & \xrightarrow{id} & N^+ \ni a \end{array}$$

By Fact 6.7(c), for some amalgamation  $(id \upharpoonright N, f, N_1)$  of  $N$  and  $N_1^-$  over  $N^-$  we have  $\widehat{NF}(N^-, f[N_1^-], N, N_1)$ . So by Proposition 6.8,  $tp(f(b), N, N_1)$  does not fork over  $N^-$ . So by the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types property, there is an amalgamation  $(id \upharpoonright N^+, g, N_1^+)$  of  $N^+$  and  $N_1$  over  $N$  with  $g(f(b)) = a$ . We have

$$(N, N^+) <_A (g[N_1], N_1^+)$$

(because  $N^+ \preceq N_1^+$ ,  $N \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} g[N_1]$  and  $a \in g[N_1] \cap N^+ - N$ ). ⊥

**Proposition 7.7.** If  $\langle (M_\alpha, M_\alpha^+) : \alpha < \delta \rangle$  is a  $<_A$ -increasing continuous sequence of pairs in  $A$  then

$$(M_\beta, M_\beta^+) <_A \left( \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha, \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha^+ \right)$$

for each  $\beta < \delta$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality,  $\beta = 0$ . We should prove that  $(M_0, M_0^+) <_A (\bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha, \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha^+)$ . By smoothness (one of the AEC's axioms),  $\bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha \preceq \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha^+$ , so  $(\bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha, \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha^+) \in A$ . By Fact 6.10(d),  $M_0 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha$ . By the definition of AEC,  $M_0^+ \preceq \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha^+$ .  $\dashv$

**Theorem 7.8.** *Suppose:*

- (1) *Hypothesis 6.5,*
- (2)  *$(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the amalgamation in  $\lambda^+$  property and*
- (3)  *$(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types property.*

*Then for every two models  $M, M^+$  of cardinality  $\lambda^+$  the following holds:*

$$M \preceq M^+ \Leftrightarrow M \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M^+.$$

*Proof.* If  $M \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M^+$  then by definition  $M \preceq M^+$ .

Conversely, suppose  $M \preceq M^+$ . Without loss of generality,  $M \neq M^+$ .

It is sufficient to find a pair  $(N, N^+) \in A$  such that  $(M, M^+) <_A (N, N^+)$  and  $N = N^+$ , because it yields  $M^+ \preceq N$  and  $M \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} N$  and so by Fact 6.10(c),  $M \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M^+$ . By Proposition 3.10, the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types property holds. Hence, by Proposition 7.6, it is sufficient to find a pair  $(N, N^+) \in A$  such that  $(M, M^+) <_A (N, N^+)$  and  $(N, N^+)$  is a  $<_A$ -maximal pair in  $A$ .

For the sake of a contradiction, assume that there is no  $<_A$ -maximal pair. We choose by induction on  $\alpha < \lambda^{++}$  a pair  $(M_\alpha, M_\alpha^+) \in A$  such that for every  $\alpha < \lambda^{++}$ ,  $(M_\alpha, M_\alpha^+) <_A (M_{\alpha+1}, M_{\alpha+1}^+)$  and for every limit  $\alpha < \lambda^{++}$ ,  $M_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} M_\beta$  and  $M_\alpha^+ = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} M_\beta^+$  (so by Proposition 7.7,  $(M_\beta, M_\beta^+) <_A (M_\alpha, M_\alpha^+)$  for each  $\beta < \alpha$ ). Define  $M_{\lambda^{++}} := \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda^{++}} M_\alpha$ . The sequences  $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^{++} \rangle$  and  $\langle M_\alpha^+ \cap M_{\lambda^{++}} : \alpha < \lambda^{++} \rangle$  are filtrations of  $M_{\lambda^{++}}$ . So for some  $\alpha < \lambda^{++}$  (actually, for a club of  $\alpha$ 's) we have  $M_\alpha = M_\alpha^+ \cap M_{\lambda^{++}}$ . So

$$M_\alpha \subseteq M_\alpha^+ \cap M_{\alpha+1} \subseteq M_\alpha^+ \cap M_{\lambda^{++}} = M_\alpha.$$

Therefore  $M_\alpha^+ \cap M_{\alpha+1} = M_\alpha$ , which is impossible, because  $(M_\alpha, M_\alpha^+) <_A (M_{\alpha+1}, M_{\alpha+1}^+)$ . A contradiction.  $\dashv$

Hypotheses (2) and (3) in Theorem 7.8 relate to all the models of cardinality  $\lambda^+$ . Theorem 7.15 is one of the main theorems of the paper. It is a version of Theorem 7.8, where Hypotheses (2) and (3) relate to the saturated models (in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ ) only. Before stating it, we make preparations.

The proof of Theorem 7.15 is similar to the proof of Theorem 7.8, but more complicated. The main difficulty is in the proof of Proposition 7.12, the analogous of Proposition 7.6. In the proof of Proposition 7.6, we use  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types. But in order to apply the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models property, we should prove that the model  $N$ , appearing in the proof of Proposition 7.6, is saturated in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ .

In order to overcome this difficulty, we replace the class of pairs  $A$ , by the class  $B$  of pairs  $(M_1, M_1^+) \in A$  such that  $M_1 \in K^{sat}$ . Now we can apply the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models property.

Unfortunately, a new problem arises: Not every  $<_A$  extension of a pair in  $B$  is in  $B$ . In order to solve this problem, we use the relation  $\prec_{\lambda^+}^+$  and the  $\prec_{\lambda^+}^+$ -game. The relation  $\prec_{\lambda^+}^+$  is defined in [9, Definition 7.1.4], but only several properties of  $\prec_{\lambda^+}^+$  are applied here, not its precise definition. The following fact exhibits the properties of  $\prec_{\lambda^+}^+$ , that are applied in the proof of Theorem 7.15.

**Fact 7.9.** *There is a relation  $\prec_{\lambda^+}^+$  on  $K_{\lambda^+}$ , satisfying the following properties:*

- (1) *for every  $N_1 \in K_{\lambda^+}$  we can find  $N_2$  such that  $N_1 \prec_{\lambda^+}^+ N_2$ ,*
- (2) *if  $N_1 \prec_{\lambda^+}^+ N_2$  then  $N_1 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} N_2$  and  $N_2$  is saturated in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$  and*
- (3) *Player 1 has a winning strategy in the  $\prec_{\lambda^+}^+$ -game (see Definition 7.10 below).*

*Proof.* Clauses (1)-(3) of Fact 7.9 are restatements of Theorems 7.1.12(a), 7.1.10(a),(b) and 7.1.12(c) of [9] respectively.  $\dashv$

We restate [9, Definition 7.1.11] as follows:

**Definition 7.10.** The  $\prec_{\lambda^+}^+$ -game is a game between two players, Player 0 and Player 1. The game has  $\lambda^+$  rounds. In any round, the players choose two models,  $N_{0,\alpha}, N_{1,\alpha}$  in  $K_\lambda$  (usually, Player 0 chooses the model  $N_{0,\alpha}$  and Player 1 chooses the model  $N_{1,\alpha}$ , but in the first round, Player 0 chooses both) with the following rules:

The first round: Player 0 chooses models  $N_{0,0}, N_{1,0} \in K_\lambda$  with  $N_{0,0} \preceq N_{1,0}$  and Player 1 does not do anything.

The  $\alpha$  round where  $\alpha$  is limit: Player 0 must choose  $N_{0,\alpha} := \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} N_{0,\beta}$  and Player 1 must choose  $N_{1,\alpha} := \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} N_{1,\beta}$ .

The  $\alpha + 1$  round: Player 0 chooses a model  $N_{0,\alpha+1}$  such that the following hold:

- (1)  $N_{0,\alpha} \preceq N_{0,\alpha+1}$ .
- (2)  $N_{0,\alpha+1} \cap N_{1,\alpha} = N_{0,\alpha}$ .

After Player 0 chooses  $N_{0,\alpha+1}$ , Player 1 has to choose  $N_{1,\alpha+1}$  such that  $NF(N_{0,\alpha}, N_{1,\alpha}, N_{0,\alpha+1}, N_{1,\alpha+1})$ .

At the end of the play, Player 1 wins the game if

$$\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda^+} N_{0,\alpha} \prec_{\lambda^+}^+ \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda^+} N_{1,\alpha}.$$

Otherwise Player 0 wins the game.

A position after  $\alpha + \frac{1}{2}$  rounds is a triple

$$(\alpha, \langle N_{0,\beta} : \beta \leq \alpha + 1 \rangle, \langle N_{1,\beta} : \beta \leq \alpha \rangle)$$

that satisfies the following conditions:

- (1)  $\alpha < \lambda^+$ .
- (2)  $\langle N_{0,\beta} : \beta \leq \alpha + 1 \rangle, \langle N_{1,\beta} : \beta \leq \alpha \rangle$  are increasing continuous sequences of models in  $K_\lambda$ .
- (3)  $NF(N_{0,\beta}, N_{1,\beta}, N_{0,\beta+1}, N_{1,\beta+1})$  for  $\beta < \alpha$ .
- (4)  $N_{0,\alpha+1} \cap N_{1,\alpha} = N_{0,\alpha}$ .

A *strategy for Player 1* is a function  $F$  that assigns a model  $N_{1,\alpha+1}$  satisfying  $NF(N_{0,\alpha}, N_{1,\alpha}, N_{0,\alpha+1}, N_{1,\alpha+1})$  to each position after  $\alpha + \frac{1}{2}$  rounds.

A *winning strategy for Player 1* is a strategy for Player 1, such that if Player 1 acts by it, then he wins the game, no matter what Player 0 does.

We define a partial order  $(B, <_B)$  such that  $B$  is the class of pairs  $(M_1, M_1^+) \in A$  with  $M_1 \in K^{sat}$  and  $<_B$  is the restriction of  $<_A$  to  $B$ .

**Definition 7.11.** Define  $B$  as the class of pairs,  $(M_1, M_1^+)$  of models of cardinality  $\lambda^+$  such that  $M_1$  is saturated over  $\lambda$  and  $M_1 \preceq M_1^+$ . Define a strict partial order,  $<_B$  on  $B$ , by:  $(M_1, M_1^+) <_B (M_2, M_2^+)$  when the following hold:

- (1)  $M_1 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_2$ ,
- (2)  $M_1^+ \preceq M_2^+$ ,
- (3)  $M_2 \cap M_1^+ \neq M_1$ .

Proposition 7.12 is the analog of Proposition 7.6.

**Proposition 7.12.** Assume the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models property. Let  $(N, N^+) \in B$ . If  $(N, N^+)$  is  $<_B$ -maximal then  $N = N^+$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(N, N^+)$  be a pair in  $B$  with  $N \neq N^+$ . We should prove that  $(N, N^+)$  is not  $<_B$ -maximal.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 b \in N_{1,0} & \xrightarrow{id} & N_{1,\alpha} & \xrightarrow{id} & N_{1,\alpha+1} & \xrightarrow{id} & N_1 & \xrightarrow{g} & N_1^+ \\
 f_0=id \uparrow & & f_\alpha \uparrow & & f_{\alpha+1} \uparrow & & f_{\lambda^+} \uparrow & \prec_{\lambda^+}^+ & \uparrow f^* \\
 N_{0,0} & \xrightarrow{id} & N_{0,\alpha} & \xrightarrow{id} & N_{0,\alpha+1} & \xrightarrow{id} & N & \xrightarrow{id} & N^+ \ni a
 \end{array}$$

By Fact 7.4 (density of basic types over models of cardinality greater than  $\lambda$ ), there is an element  $a \in N^+ - N$  such that  $tp(a, N, N^+)$  is basic. Let  $\langle N_{0,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  be a filtration of  $N$ . By Definition 2.10, for some  $\alpha < \lambda^+$ ,  $tp(a, N, N^+)$  does not fork over  $N_{0,\alpha}$ . So by renaming, without loss of generality,  $tp(a, N, N^+)$  does not fork over  $N_{0,0}$ . Let  $N_{1,0} \in K_\lambda$  and let  $b \in N_{1,0}$  such that  $tp(b, N_{0,0}, N_{1,0}) = tp(a, N_{0,0}, N^+)$ .

Define  $f_0 : N_{0,0} \rightarrow N_{1,0}$  by  $f_0(x) = x$ . Let  $F$  be a winning strategy for Player 1 in the  $\prec_{\lambda^+}^+$ -game. We choose  $N_{1,\alpha} \in K_\lambda$  and an injection  $f_\alpha : N_{0,\alpha} \rightarrow N_{1,\alpha}$  by induction on  $\alpha \in (0, \lambda^+)$  such that the following hold:

- (1)  $f_{\alpha+1}(x) = f_\alpha(x)$ , for each  $x \in N_{0,\alpha}$ ,
- (2)  $f_{\alpha+1}[N_{0,\alpha+1}] \cap N_{1,\alpha} = f_\alpha[N_{0,\alpha}]$ ,
- (3) if  $\alpha$  is limit then  $f_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} f_\beta$ ,

- (4)  $N_{1,\alpha+1} := F(\alpha, \langle f_\beta[N_{0,\beta}] : \beta \leq \alpha + 1 \rangle, \langle N_{1,\beta} : \beta \leq \alpha \rangle)$ ,
- (5) if  $\alpha$  is limit then  $N_{1,\alpha} := \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} N_{1,\beta}$ .

This induction can be described as a play of the  $\prec_{\lambda^+}^+$ -game, where at the  $\alpha$  round, Player 0 chooses the model  $f_\alpha[N_{0,\alpha}]$  explicitly, by choosing  $f_\alpha$  (so when we refer to the definition of the  $\prec_{\lambda^+}^+$ -game,  $f_\alpha[N_{0,\alpha}]$  stands for  $N_{0,\alpha}$ ). Hence, the  $\alpha$  round is as follows: For  $\alpha = 0$ , Player 0 chooses  $N_{0,0}$  and  $N_{1,0}$ . For  $\alpha$  limit, Player 0 chooses the model  $f_\alpha[N_{0,\alpha}] = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} f_\beta[N_{0,\beta}]$  and Player 1 chooses the model  $N_{1,\alpha} := \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} N_{1,\beta}$  (see Clauses (3) and (5)).

In the  $\alpha+1$  round, Player 0 chooses the model  $f_{\alpha+1}[N_{0,\alpha+1}]$  (explicitly, by choosing  $f_{\alpha+1}$ ) such that Clauses (1) and (2) hold. It is a legal move: On the one hand, since  $N_{0,\alpha} \preceq N_{0,\alpha+1}$ , Clause (1) yields  $f_\alpha[N_{0,\alpha}] = f_{\alpha+1}[N_{0,\alpha}] \preceq f_{\alpha+1}[N_{0,\alpha+1}]$ , so Condition (1) of a legal move for Player 0 holds. On the other hand, Clause (2) is Condition (2) of a legal move for Player 0. Now  $N_{1,\alpha+1} := F(\alpha, \langle f_\beta[N_{0,\beta}] : \beta \leq \alpha + 1 \rangle, \langle N_{1,\beta} : \beta \leq \alpha \rangle)$  is the choice of Player 1.

Define  $f_{\lambda^+} := \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda^+} f_\alpha$  and  $N_1 := \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda^+} N_{1,\alpha}$ .

Since  $F$  is a winning strategy,  $\widehat{NF}(f_\alpha[N_{0,\alpha}], f_{\alpha+1}[N_{0,\alpha+1}], N_{1,\alpha}, N_{1,\alpha+1})$  holds, for every  $\alpha < \lambda^+$ . So  $f_\alpha[N_{0,\alpha}] \preceq N_{1,\alpha}$  for each  $\alpha < \lambda^+$ . Since the sequences  $\langle f_\alpha[N_{0,\alpha}] : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  and  $\langle N_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  are increasing and continuous (by Clauses (3) and (5)), they witness that  $\widehat{NF}(N_{0,0}, N_{1,0}, f_{\lambda^+}[N], N_1)$  (note that  $f_{\lambda^+}[N_{0,0}] = N_{0,0}$ ). So by Proposition 6.8  $tp(b, f_{\lambda^+}[N], N_1)$  does not fork over  $N_{0,0}$ .

Let  $f^*$  be a function with domain  $N^+$  extending  $f_{\lambda^+}$ . Then the types  $tp(b, f^*[N], N_1)$  and  $tp(f^*(a), f^*[N], f^*[N^+])$  do not fork over  $f^*[N_{0,0}] = N_{0,0}$ . But the types over  $N_{0,0}$  are equal:

$$tp(b, N_{0,0}, N_1) = tp(a, N_{0,0}, N^+) = tp(f^*(a), N_{0,0}, f^*[N^+]).$$

Since  $(N, N^+) \in B$ , we have  $N \in K^{sat}$ , so  $f^*[N] \in K^{sat}$ . Hence, by the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models property, there is an amalgamation of  $N_1$  and  $f^*[N^+]$  over  $f^*[N]$  such that the images of  $b$  and  $f^*(a)$  coincide. Equivalently, for some model  $N_1^+ \in K_{\lambda^+}$ , for some embedding  $g : N_1 \rightarrow N_1^+$  fixing  $f^*[N]$  pointwise we have  $g(b) = f^*(a)$  and the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} b \in N_1 & \xrightarrow{g} & N_1^+ \\ f_{\lambda^+} \uparrow & & \uparrow f^* \\ N & \xrightarrow{id} & N^+ \ni a \end{array}$$

Since the relation  $<_B$  is closed under isomorphisms, it is sufficient to prove that  $(f^*[N], f^*[N^+]) <_B (g[N_1], N_1^+)$ . But it follows by Clauses (2)-(5) of the following subclaim:

**Subclaim 7.13.**

- (1)  $f^*[N] \prec_{\lambda^+}^+ N_1$ ,
- (2)  $f^*[N] \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} g[N_1]$ ,
- (3)  $g[N_1] \in K^{sat}$ ,
- (4)  $f^*[N^+] \preceq N_1^+$  and
- (5)  $g(b) = f^*(a) \in f^*[N^+] \cap g[N_1] - f^*[N]$ .

*Proof.*

- (1) Since  $F$  is a winning strategy, Player 1 wins the game. Therefore  $f^*[N] \prec_{\lambda^+}^+ N_1$ .
- (2) By Clause (1) and Fact 7.9(2),  $f^*[N] \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} N_1$ . Since  $g$  fixes  $f^*[N]$  pointwise and the relation  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  is closed under isomorphism,  $f^*[N] = g[f^*[N]] \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} g[N_1]$ .
- (3) By Clause (1) and Fact 7.9(2),  $N_1 \in K^{sat}$ . Since  $K^{sat}$  is closed under isomorphisms,  $g[N_1] \in K^{sat}$ .
- (4) Obvious.
- (5) Obvious.

⊢

The proof of Proposition 7.12 is completed.

⊢

Proposition 7.14 is analogous to Proposition 7.7.

**Proposition 7.14.** *If  $\langle (M_\alpha, M_\alpha^+) : \alpha < \delta \rangle$  is a  $<_B$ -increasing continuous sequence of pairs in  $B$  then*

$$(M_\beta, M_\beta^+) <_B \left( \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha, \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha^+ \right)$$

for each  $\beta < \delta$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality,  $\beta = 0$ . We should prove that  $(M_0, M_0^+) <_B (\bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha, \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha^+)$ . By Proposition 7.7,  $(M_0, M_0^+) <_A (\bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha, \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha^+)$ . It remains to show that  $\bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha$  is a saturated model in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ .

$\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$  is a  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$ -increasing and continuous sequence of models in  $K^{sat}$ . So by [9, Theorem 7.18(a)],  $\bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha \in K^{sat}$ . Hence,  $(\bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha, \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} M_\alpha^+) \in B$ . Proposition 7.14 is proved. ⊢

Now we prove Theorem 1.6:

**Theorem 7.15.** *Suppose:*

- (1) Hypothesis 6.5,
- (2) every saturated model in  $\lambda^+$  is an amalgamation base and
- (3)  $(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models property.

Then for every two models  $M, M^+ \in K^{sat}$  the following holds:

$$M \preceq M^+ \Leftrightarrow M \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M^+.$$

*Proof.* Let  $M, M^+$  be two saturated models in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ . If  $M \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M^+$  then by definition  $M \preceq M^+$ .

Conversely, assume that  $M \preceq M^+$ . As in the proof of Theorem 7.8, it is sufficient to find a pair  $(N, N^+) \in B$  such that  $(M, M^+) <_B (N, N^+)$  and  $N = N^+$ . By Proposition 3.15 and Clauses (2) and (3),  $(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models property. Hence, by Proposition 7.12, it is sufficient to find a pair  $(N, N^+) \in B$  such that  $(M, M^+) <_B (N, N^+)$  and  $(N, N^+)$  is  $<_B$ -maximal pair in  $B$ .

We now can complete the proof of Theorem 7.15 as in the proof of Theorem 7.8 (where Proposition 7.12 replaces Proposition 7.6 and Proposition 7.14 replaces Proposition 7.7).  $\dashv$

Corollary 7.16 is a special case of Proposition 3.10. We present it, in order to show a new proof of the fact, that assuming Hypothesis 6.5, the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types implies the amalgamation property.

**Corollary 7.16.** *Suppose:*

- (1) *Hypothesis 6.5 and*
- (2)  *$(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types property.*

*Then  $K$  satisfies the amalgamation property in  $\lambda^+$ .*

*Proof.* By [9, Corollary 7.1.17(a)],  $(K_{\lambda^+}, \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} \upharpoonright K_{\lambda^+})$  satisfies the amalgamation property. In the proof of Theorem 7.8, we do not use the amalgamation in  $\lambda^+$  property, only the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types property. So by the proof of Theorem 7.8, the corollary holds.  $\dashv$

Corollary 7.17 is a special case of Proposition 3.16. It is analogous to Corollary 7.16. While in the proof of Corollary 7.16, we use the proof of Theorem 7.8, here, we use the proof of Theorem 7.15.

**Corollary 7.17.** *Suppose:*

- (1) *Hypothesis 6.5 and*
- (2)  *$(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models property.*

*Then every model  $M \in K^{sat}$  is an amalgamation base.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $M_0 \in K^{sat}$ ,  $M_1, M_2 \in K_{\lambda^+}$ ,  $M_0 \preceq M_1$  and  $M_0 \preceq M_2$ . We have to amalgamate  $M_1, M_2$  over  $M_0$ . By [9, Theorem 7.1.12.a], we can find  $M_1^+, M_2^+ \in K^{sat}$  such that  $M_1 \preceq M_1^+$  and  $M_2 \preceq M_2^+$ . Since the relation  $\preceq$  is transitive, we have  $M_0 \preceq M_1^+$  and  $M_0 \preceq M_2^+$ . Therefore by Theorem 7.15 (where we replace hypotheses (2) and (3) of this theorem, by the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models property) and Assumption (2),  $M_0 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_1^+$  and  $M_0 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_2^+$ . So, by [9, Theorem 7.1.18.c], we can find an amalgamation  $(f_1, f_2, M_3)$  of  $M_1^+, M_2^+$  over  $M_0$ . Hence,  $(f_1 \upharpoonright M_1, f_2 \upharpoonright M_2, M_3)$  is an amalgamation of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  over  $M_0$ .  $\dashv$

In Corollaries 7.18 and 7.19, we do not assume strong tameness, but tameness only.

**Corollary 7.18.** *Suppose:*

- (1) *Hypothesis 6.5 and*
- (2)  *$(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types property.*

*The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) *the relations  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  and  $\preceq \upharpoonright K_{\lambda^+}$  are equivalent.*
- (b) *the amalgamation property in  $\lambda^+$  holds,*
- (c)  *$(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types property.*

*Proof.*

(a)  $\rightarrow$  (b): By [9, Corollary 7.1.17(a)].

(b)  $\rightarrow$  (c): Obvious. It is similar to Remark 3.3.

(c)  $\rightarrow$  (a): By Theorem 7.8. –

**Corollary 7.19.** *Suppose:*

- (1) *Hypothesis 6.5 and*
- (2)  *$(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models property.*

*The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) *the relations  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} \upharpoonright K^{nice}$  and  $\preceq \upharpoonright K^{nice}$  are equivalent.*
- (b)  *$(K^{nice}, \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} \upharpoonright K^{nice})$  satisfies the amalgamation property,*
- (c)  *$(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the strong  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models property.*

*Proof.*

(a)  $\rightarrow$  (b): By [9, Corollary 7.1.17(a)].

(b)  $\rightarrow$  (c): Obvious.

(c)  $\rightarrow$  (a): By Theorem 7.15. –

## 8. PROVING CONTINUITY

In this section, we get the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -continuity of serial independence property, using the relation  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$ .

In Proposition 8.2 we amalgamate two sequences of models such that  $NF$  holds. In Proposition 8.3 we amalgamate models such that the relation  $\widehat{NF}$  holds and in addition we get independence. Proposition 8.3 and the weak uniqueness property of the relation  $\widehat{NF}$  yield Proposition 8.4. Proposition 8.4 says that the relation  $\widehat{NF}$  respects independence, in some sense. Using Proposition 8.4, we prove Theorem 8.5. This theorem presents sufficient conditions for the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -continuity of serial independence property.

The proof of Proposition 8.2 is similar to known proofs ([9, Proposition 3.1.10], for example), but for completeness, we give it. Proposition 8.1 is a special case of Proposition 8.2. But in the proof of Proposition 8.2, we

apply Proposition 8.1. The proof of Proposition 8.2 is similar to known proofs ([9, Proposition 3.1.10], for example), but for completeness, we give it. Proposition 8.1 is a special case of Proposition 8.2. But in the proof of Proposition 8.2, we apply Proposition 8.1.

**Proposition 8.1.** *Let  $\alpha^* \leq \lambda^+$  and let  $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$  be an increasing continuous sequence of models of cardinality  $\lambda$ . Let  $N \in K_\lambda$  with  $M_0 \preceq N$ . Then we can find an increasing continuous sequence,  $\langle N_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$  of models in  $K_\lambda$  and an embedding  $f : N \rightarrow N_0$  fixing  $M_0$  pointwise, such that  $NF(M_\alpha, N_\alpha, M_{\alpha+1}, N_{\alpha+1})$  holds for each  $\alpha$  satisfying  $\alpha + 1 < \alpha^*$ .*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 N & \xrightarrow{f} & N_0 & \longrightarrow & N_\alpha & \xrightarrow{id} & N_{\alpha+1} \\
 & \searrow id & \uparrow id & & \uparrow id & & \uparrow id \\
 & & M_0 & \longrightarrow & M_\alpha & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{\alpha+1}
 \end{array}$$

*Proof.* We choose  $N_\alpha \in K_\lambda$  and an embedding  $g_\alpha : M_\alpha \rightarrow N_\alpha$  by induction on  $\alpha < \alpha^*$  such that for every  $\alpha < \alpha^*$ , the following hold:

- (1)  $N \preceq N_0$ ,
- (2) if  $\alpha + 1 < \alpha^*$  then  $N_\alpha \preceq N_{\alpha+1}$ ,  $g_\alpha \subseteq g_{\alpha+1}$  and  $NF(g_\alpha[M_\alpha], g_{\alpha+1}[M_{\alpha+1}], N_\alpha, N_{\alpha+1})$  and
- (3) if  $\alpha$  is limit then  $N_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} N_\beta$  and  $g_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} g_\beta$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 N & \xrightarrow{id} & N_0 & \xrightarrow{id} & N_\alpha & \xrightarrow{id} & N_{\alpha+1} \\
 & \searrow id & \uparrow g_0 & & \uparrow g_\alpha & & \uparrow g_{\alpha+1} \\
 & & M_0 & \xrightarrow{id} & M_\alpha & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{\alpha+1}
 \end{array}$$

Now let  $h$  be an injection of  $\bigcup_{\alpha < \alpha^*} N_\alpha$  extending  $(\bigcup_{\alpha < \alpha^*} g_\alpha)^{-1}$ . The sequence  $\langle h[N_\alpha] : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$  and the embedding  $h \upharpoonright N$  are as needed.  $\dashv$

**Proposition 8.2.** *Let  $\alpha^*, \beta^*$  be two ordinals  $\leq \lambda^+$  and let  $\langle M_{a,\alpha} : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$  and  $\langle M_{b,\alpha} : \alpha < \beta^* \rangle$  be two increasing continuous sequences of models of cardinality  $\lambda$  such that  $M_{a,0} = M_{b,0}$ . Then there is a ‘rectangle of models’  $\{M_{\alpha,\beta} : \alpha < \alpha^*, \beta < \beta^*\}$  and a sequence  $\{f_\beta : \beta < \beta^*\}$  such that for every  $\alpha < \alpha^*$  and  $\beta < \beta^*$  the following hold:*

- (1)  $M_{\alpha,\beta} \in K_\lambda$ ,
- (2) if  $\alpha + 1 < \alpha^*$  then  $M_{\alpha,\beta} \preceq M_{\alpha+1,\beta}$ ,
- (3) if  $\beta = \gamma + 1$  then  $M_{\alpha,\gamma} \preceq M_{\alpha,\gamma+1}$ ,
- (4) if  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal then  $M_{\alpha,\beta} = \bigcup_{\alpha' < \alpha} M_{\alpha',\beta}$ ,
- (5) if  $\beta$  is a limit ordinal then  $M_{\alpha,\beta} = \bigcup_{\beta' < \beta} M_{\alpha,\beta'}$ ,
- (6)  $f_\beta$  is an isomorphism of  $M_{b,\beta}$  onto  $M_{0,\beta}$ ,
- (7) if  $\beta = 0$  then  $M_{\alpha,\beta} = M_{a,\alpha}$  and  $f_\beta$  is the identity on  $M_{a,0} = M_{b,0}$ ,
- (8)  $f_{\beta'} \subseteq f_\beta$  for every  $\beta' < \beta$ ,
- (9) if  $\beta$  is a limit ordinal then  $f_\beta = \bigcup_{\beta' < \beta} f_{\beta'}$ ,

(10) if  $\beta = \gamma + 1$  then  $NF(M_{\alpha,\gamma}, M_{\alpha,\beta}, M_{\alpha+1,\gamma}, M_{\beta,\gamma+1})$ , unless  $\alpha + 1 = \alpha^*$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 M_{\alpha+1}^a = M_{\alpha+1,0} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{\alpha+1,\beta} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{\alpha+1,\beta+1} \\
 \uparrow id & & \uparrow id & & \uparrow id \\
 M_{\alpha}^a = M_{\alpha,0} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{\alpha,\beta} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{\alpha,\beta+1} \\
 \uparrow id & & \uparrow id & & \uparrow id \\
 M_0^a = M_{0,0} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{0,\beta} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{0,\beta+1} \\
 \uparrow f_0 & & \uparrow f_{\beta} & & \uparrow f_{\beta+1} \\
 M_0^b & & M_{\beta}^b & & M_{\beta+1}^b
 \end{array}$$

*Proof.* For  $n = 1, 2, \dots, 10$ , let  $(n)_{\beta}$  denote Clause  $n$  for  $\beta$ . We choose by induction on  $\beta < \beta^*$  a set of models  $\{M_{\alpha,\beta} : \alpha < \alpha^*\}$  and a function  $f_{\beta}$  such that Clauses  $(1)_{\beta}$ – $(10)_{\beta}$  hold.

*Case a:*  $\beta = 0$ . In this case, Clause (7) determines the construction. Clauses  $(1)_{\beta}, (2)_{\beta}, (4)_{\beta}$  and  $(6)_{\beta}$  hold by an assumption. Clauses  $(3)_{\beta}, (5)_{\beta}, (8)_{\beta}, (9)_{\beta}$  and  $(10)_{\beta}$  are not relevant.

*Case b:*  $\beta$  is a limit ordinal. In this case, Clauses  $(3)_{\beta}, (7)_{\beta}$  and  $(10)_{\beta}$  are not relevant. By Clause  $(5)_{\beta}$ , we must choose  $M_{\alpha,\beta} = \bigcup_{\beta' < \beta} M_{\alpha,\beta'}$  and by Clause  $(9)_{\beta}$ , we must choose  $f_{\beta} = \bigcup_{\beta' < \beta} f_{\beta'}$ . Easily, Clauses  $(1)_{\beta}, (6)_{\beta}$  and  $(8)_{\beta}$  hold.

Let us prove that Clause  $(2)_{\beta}$  holds. Fix  $\alpha$  with  $\alpha + 1 < \alpha^*$ . By Clause  $(3)_{\beta'}$  for  $\beta' < \beta$ , the sequences  $\langle M_{\alpha,\beta'} : \beta' < \beta \rangle$  and  $\langle M_{\alpha+1,\beta'} : \beta' < \beta \rangle$  are increasing. By Clause  $(5)_{\beta'}$  for  $\beta' < \beta$ , these sequences are continuous. So by smoothness  $M_{\alpha,\beta} \preceq M_{\alpha+1,\beta}$ , namely, Clause  $(2)_{\beta}$  holds.

It remains to prove that Clause  $(4)_{\beta}$ , namely, to show that if  $\alpha$  is limit then  $M_{\alpha,\beta} = \bigcup_{\alpha' < \alpha} M_{\alpha',\beta}$ . On the one hand, if  $x \in M_{\alpha',\beta}$  for some  $\alpha' < \alpha$  then by the definition of  $M_{\alpha',\beta}$ ,  $x \in M_{\alpha',\beta'}$  for some  $\beta' < \beta$ . By the induction hypothesis, namely,  $(4)_{\beta'}$ ,  $M_{\alpha',\beta'} \subseteq M_{\alpha,\beta'}$ . But  $M_{\alpha,\beta'} \subseteq M_{\alpha,\beta}$ . Whence,  $\bigcup_{\alpha' < \alpha} M_{\alpha',\beta} \subseteq M_{\alpha,\beta}$ . On the other hand, if  $x \in M_{\alpha,\beta}$  then  $x \in M_{\alpha,\beta'}$  for some  $\beta' < \beta$ . Therefore by  $(4)_{\beta'}$ ,  $x \in M_{\alpha',\beta'}$  for some  $\alpha' < \alpha$ . But  $M_{\alpha',\beta'} \subseteq M_{\alpha',\beta}$ . Whence,  $M_{\alpha,\beta} \subseteq \bigcup_{\alpha' < \alpha} M_{\alpha',\beta}$ .

*Case c:*  $\beta = \gamma + 1$ . We apply Proposition 8.1, where  $M_{\alpha,\gamma}$  stands for  $M_{\alpha}$ . By this proposition, we can find an increasing continuous sequence of models,  $\langle N_{\alpha} : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$  of models in  $K$  of cardinality  $\lambda$  and an embedding  $f : M_{\gamma+1}^b \rightarrow N_0$  such that  $f_{\gamma} \subseteq f$  and for each  $\alpha < \alpha^*$  we have  $NF(M_{\alpha,\gamma}, N_{\alpha}, M_{\alpha+1,\gamma}, N_{\alpha+1})$ . Define  $M_{\alpha,\beta} := N_{\alpha}$  and  $f_{\beta} := f$ . Hence, we have found an increasing continuous sequence of models,  $\langle M_{\alpha,\beta} : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$  of

models in  $K$  of cardinality  $\lambda$  and an embedding  $f_\beta : M_{\gamma+1}^b \rightarrow M_{0,\beta}$  such that  $f_\gamma \subseteq f_\beta$  and for each  $\alpha < \alpha^*$  we have  $NF(M_{\alpha,\gamma}, M_{\alpha,\beta}, M_{\alpha+1,\gamma}, M_{\alpha+1,\beta})$ . So  $(1)_\beta, (2)_\beta, (4)_\beta, (6)_\beta, (8)_\beta$  and  $(10)_\beta$  hold. But  $(10)_\beta$  yields  $(3)_\beta$  and  $(5)_\beta, (7)_\beta, (9)_\beta$  are irrelevant for a successor  $\beta$ .  $\dashv$

Suppose  $\langle M_\alpha, a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle \frown \langle M_{\alpha^*} \rangle$  is independent and  $M_0$  is of cardinality  $\lambda$ . Suppose that  $M_0 \preceq N_0 \in K_{\lambda^+}$ . Proposition 8.3 says that in such a case, we can amalgamate  $M_{\alpha^*}$  and  $N_0$  over  $M_0$  such that the sequence  $\langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$  will be independent. Moreover, we can choose the amalgamation such that  $\widehat{NF}$  will hold.

**Proposition 8.3.** *If*

- (1)  $\alpha^* < \lambda^+$ ,
- (2)  $M_\alpha \in K_\lambda$  for every  $\alpha \leq \alpha^*$ ,
- (3) the sequence  $\langle M_\alpha, a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle \frown \langle M_{\alpha^*} \rangle$  is independent and
- (4)  $M_0 \preceq N_0 \in K_{\lambda^+}$

then for some  $N_1 \in K_{\lambda^+}$  and some embedding  $f : N_0 \rightarrow N_1$  fixing  $M_0$  pointwise, the sequence  $\langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$  is independent in  $(f[N_0], N_1)$  and  $\widehat{NF}(M_0, M_{\alpha^*}, f[N_0], N_1)$  holds.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 M_{\alpha^*} & \longrightarrow & N_1 \\
 \uparrow id & & \uparrow f \\
 M_\alpha & & \\
 \uparrow id & & \\
 M_0 & \xrightarrow{id} & N_0
 \end{array}$$

*Proof.* Let  $\langle M_\beta^b : \beta < \lambda^+ \rangle$  be a filtration of  $N_0$  such that  $M_0^b = M_0$ . For every  $\alpha < \alpha^*$  define  $M_\alpha^a =: M_\alpha$ . By Proposition 8.2, there is a ‘rectangle of models’  $\{M_{\alpha,\beta} : \alpha < \alpha^*, \beta < \lambda^+\}$  and a set of embeddings  $\{f_\beta : \beta < \lambda^+\}$  satisfying Clauses (1)-(10) of Proposition 8.2. Define  $M_{\alpha,\lambda^+} =: \bigcup_{\beta < \lambda^+} M_{\alpha,\beta}$  for every  $\alpha < \alpha^*$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
M_{\alpha^*} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{\alpha^*,\beta} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{\alpha^*,\beta+1} & \xrightarrow{id} & N_1 \\
id \uparrow & & id \uparrow & & id \uparrow & & id \uparrow \\
a_\alpha \in M_{\alpha+1} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{\alpha+1,\beta} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{\alpha+1,\beta+1} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{\alpha+1,\lambda^+} \ni a_\alpha \\
id \uparrow & & id \uparrow & & id \uparrow & & id \uparrow \\
M_\alpha & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{\alpha,\beta} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{\alpha,\beta+1} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{\alpha,\lambda^+} \\
id \uparrow & & id \uparrow & & id \uparrow & & id \uparrow \\
M_0 & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{0,\beta} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{0,\beta+1} & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{0,\lambda^+} \\
= \uparrow & & f_\beta \uparrow & & f_{\beta+1} \uparrow & & f \uparrow \\
M_0^b & \xrightarrow{id} & M_\beta^b & \xrightarrow{id} & M_{\beta+1}^b & \xrightarrow{id} & N_0
\end{array}$$

$\langle M_{\alpha,\lambda^+} : \alpha \leq \alpha^* \rangle$  is an increasing continuous sequence of models of cardinality  $\lambda^+$ . By Clauses (3),(5) and (10) of Proposition 8.2, we have  $\widehat{NF}(M_\alpha, M_{\alpha+1}, M_{\alpha,\lambda^+}, M_{\alpha+1,\lambda^+})$ . But the relation  $\widehat{NF}$  respects the frame and  $tp(a_\alpha, M_\alpha, M_{\alpha+1})$  is basic. So  $tp(a_\alpha, M_{\alpha,\lambda^+}, M_{\alpha+1,\lambda^+})$  does not fork over  $M_\alpha$ . By the definition of independence,  $tp(a_\alpha, M_\alpha, M_{\alpha+1})$  does not fork over  $M_0$ . By transitivity,  $tp(a_\alpha, M_{\alpha,\lambda^+}, M_{\alpha+1,\lambda^+})$  does not fork over  $M_0$ . Therefore by monotonicity, it does not fork over  $M_{0,\lambda^+}$ . Hence, the sequence  $\langle M_{\alpha,\lambda^+}, a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle \frown \langle M_{\alpha^*,\lambda^+} \rangle$  is independent.

Define  $N_1 := \bigcup_{\alpha < \alpha^*} M_{\alpha,\lambda^+}$  and  $f := \bigcup_{\beta < \lambda^+} f_\beta$ .

It remains to prove that  $\widehat{NF}(M_0, M_{\alpha^*}, f[N_0], N_1)$  holds. It can be proven, by using the long transitivity of the relation  $\widehat{NF}$ , but we prefer to prove it in another way. Define  $M_{\alpha^*,\beta} := \bigcup_{\alpha < \alpha^*} M_{\alpha,\beta}$  for every  $\beta < \lambda^+$ . By Clauses (2),(4) and (10) of Proposition 8.2, we have  $NF(M_{0,\beta}, M_{0,\beta+1}, M_{\alpha^*,\beta}, M_{\alpha^*,\beta+1})$  for each  $\beta < \lambda^+$ , or equivalently,  $NF(f_\beta[M_\beta^b], f_{\beta+1}[M_{\beta+1}^b], M_{\alpha^*,\beta}, M_{\alpha^*,\beta+1})$ . Since the sequences  $\langle f_\beta[M_\beta^b] : \beta < \lambda^+ \rangle$  and  $\langle M_{\alpha^*,\beta} : \beta < \lambda^+ \rangle$  are increasing and continuous,  $NF(M_0, M_{\alpha^*}, f[N_0], N_1)$  holds.  $\dashv$

The following proposition says that the relation  $\widehat{NF}$  respects independence.

**Proposition 8.4.** *Let  $\alpha^* < \lambda^+$ . Let  $M_0^-$  and  $M_1^-$  be models of cardinality  $\lambda$  and let  $M_0$  and  $M_1$  be models of cardinality  $\lambda^+$  satisfying  $\widehat{NF}(M_0^-, M_1^-, M_0, M_1)$ . Then every independent sequence,  $\langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$ , in  $(M_0^-, M_1^-)$  is independent in  $(M_0, M_1)$  as well.*

*Proof.* By Proposition 8.3, we can find  $N_1 \in K_{\lambda^+}$  and an embedding  $f : M_0 \rightarrow N_1$  such that  $\widehat{NF}(M_0^-, M_1^-, f[M_0], N_1)$  holds and the sequence  $\langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$  is independent in  $(f[M_0], N_1)$ .

By weak uniqueness of  $\widehat{NF}$  (Fact 6.7(d)), there is a model  $N_2 \in K_{\lambda^+}$  and an embedding  $g : N_1 \rightarrow N_2$  such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & N_1 & \xrightarrow{g} & N_2 \\
 & \nearrow f & \uparrow id & & \nearrow id \\
 M_0 & \xrightarrow{id} & M_1 & & \\
 \uparrow id & & \nearrow id & & \\
 M_0^- & \xrightarrow{id} & M_1^- & & 
 \end{array}$$

So  $g(f(x)) = x$ , for every  $x \in M_0$ . Hence, the sequence is independent in  $(M_0, N_2)$ , or equivalently in  $(M_0, M_1)$ .  $\dashv$

The following theorem already generalized by Boney and Vasey [7, Corollary 4.10 and Remark 4.11]: they eliminated Hypotheses (2) and (3).

**Theorem 8.5.** *Suppose:*

- (1)  $\mathfrak{s}$  is a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame
- (2)  $\mathfrak{s}$  satisfies the conjugation property,
- (3)  $K^{3,uq}$  satisfies the existence property,
- (4)  $(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the amalgamation in  $\lambda^+$  property and
- (5)  $(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types property.

*Then the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -continuity of serial independence property holds.*

*Proof.* Let  $\beta^* < \lambda^+$ ,  $M_1 \in K_{\lambda^+}$ ,  $M_1 \preceq M_2 \in K_{\lambda^+}$  and let  $\langle M_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  be a filtration of  $M_1$ . Suppose  $\langle a_\beta : \beta < \beta^* \rangle$  is independent in  $(M_{1,\alpha}, M_2)$  for each  $\alpha < \lambda^+$ . We have to prove that  $\langle a_\beta : \beta < \beta^* \rangle$  is independent in  $(M_1, M_2)$ .

By Theorem 7.8,  $M_1 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_2$ . Let  $\langle M_{2,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  be a filtration of  $M_2$ . By Remark 6.11, there is a club  $E$  of  $\lambda^+$  such that for every  $\alpha \in E$ ,  $\widehat{NF}(M_{1,\alpha}, M_{2,\alpha}, M_1, M_2)$ . Define  $J = \{a_\beta : \beta < \beta^*\}$ .  $J \subseteq M_2$ . Since  $|J| < \lambda^+$ , for some  $\alpha \in E$  we have  $J \subseteq M_{2,\alpha}$ . But  $\widehat{NF}(M_{1,\alpha}, M_{2,\alpha}, M_1, M_2)$ . So by Proposition 8.4,  $\langle a_\beta : \beta < \beta^* \rangle$  is independent in  $(M_1, M_2)$ .  $\dashv$

Theorem 8.6 is the analog of Theorem 8.5, where we restrict ourselves to the saturated models.

**Theorem 8.6.** *Suppose:*

- (1)  $\mathfrak{s}$  is a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame
- (2)  $\mathfrak{s}$  satisfies the conjugation property,
- (3)  $K^{3,uq}$  satisfies the existence property,
- (4) Every saturated model in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$  is an amalgamation base and
- (5)  $(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models property.

*Then the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -continuity of serial independence for saturated models property holds.*

*Proof.* Similar to the proof of Theorem 8.5, but here we apply Theorem 7.15 in place of Theorem 7.8.  $\dashv$

## 9. GETTING GOOD NON-FORKING $\lambda^+$ -FRAMES

Recall the definition of the third candidate of a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame (of the second version).

### Definition 9.1.

$$\mathfrak{s}^+ =: (K^{sat}, \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} \restriction K^{sat}, S_{\lambda^+}^{bs} \restriction K^{sat}, \mathbb{U} \restriction (K^{sat}, \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF})),$$

where  $\mathbb{U} \restriction (K^{sat}, \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF})$  is the set of quadruples,  $(M_0, M_1, a, M_2)$  in  $\mathbb{U}_{\lambda^+}$  such that  $M_0, M_1, M_2 \in K^{sat}$ ,  $M_0 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  and  $M_1 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_2$ .

In this section, we present sufficient conditions for  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  and  $\mathfrak{s}^+$  being good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frames.

In Corollary 9.2, we present sufficient conditions for  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  being a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame. Boney and Vasey [7, Theorem 2.1] have already generalized Corollary 9.2, eliminating two hypotheses:

- (1)  $\mathfrak{s}$  satisfies the conjugation property and
- (2) the class of uniqueness triples satisfies the existence property.

### Corollary 9.2. *Suppose:*

- (1)  $(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the joint embedding and amalgamation properties in  $\lambda$  and in  $\lambda^+$ ,
- (2)  $\mathfrak{s} = (K, \preceq, S^{bs}, \mathbb{U})$  is a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame,
- (3)  $\mathfrak{s}$  satisfies the conjugation property,
- (4)  $(K, \preceq)$  satisfies  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types and
- (5) the class of uniqueness triples satisfies the existence property.

Then  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame.

*Proof.* By Theorem 8.5, the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -continuity of serial independence property holds. Hence, by Theorem 5.4 and Condition (1) (here),  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame.  $\dashv$

### Remark 9.3. We skip two additional proofs of Corollary 9.2:

(a) Since the relations  $\preceq \restriction K_{\lambda^+}$  and  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  are equivalent and the relation  $\preceq \restriction K_{\lambda^+}$  satisfies smoothness, the relation  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  satisfies smoothness. So by the proof of [9, Theorem 10.1.9],  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame ([9, Theorem 10.1.9] relates to  $K^{sat}$ , but we use its proof only).

(b) Since the relations  $\preceq \restriction K_{\lambda^+}$  and  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  are equivalent, by the proof of [9, Proposition 10.1.12],  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  satisfies the symmetry axiom. Hence, by Theorem 4.1,  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame.

In order to apply the methods of [14].III, we should study  $\mathfrak{s}^+$ , not  $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda^+}$ ! In Corollary 9.4, we present sufficient conditions for  $\mathfrak{s}^+$  being a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame.

While Hypotheses (1) and (4) of Corollary 9.2 relate to all the models of cardinality  $\lambda^+$ , in Theorem 9.4, they relate to the models in  $K^{sat}$  only!

Let us compare the hypotheses of Theorem 9.4 with the hypotheses in [9, Theorem 11.1.5]. On the one hand, in [9, Theorem 11.1.5] we assume that there are not many models of cardinality  $\lambda^{++}$  (in addition to set theoretical hypotheses), in order to prove (the existence of uniqueness triples and) that the relation  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  satisfies smoothness. Here, we (assume that the class of uniqueness triples satisfies the existence property and) get smoothness by the equivalence between the relations. So we do not have to assume that there are not many models of cardinality  $\lambda^{++}$ . On the other hand, here, we assume that every saturated model in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$  is an amalgamation base and that the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models property holds.

Now we prove Theorem 1.7:

**Theorem 9.4.** *Suppose:*

- (1)  $(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the joint embedding and amalgamation properties in  $\lambda$  (actually, implied by (2)),
- (2)  $\mathfrak{s} = (K, \preceq, S^{bs}, \mathbb{U})$  is a semi-good non-forking  $\lambda$ -frame,
- (3)  $\mathfrak{s}$  satisfies the conjugation property,
- (4) every saturated model in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$  is an amalgamation base,
- (5)  $(K, \preceq)$  satisfies the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -tameness for non-forking types over saturated models property and
- (6) the class of uniqueness triples satisfies the existence property.

Then  $\mathfrak{s}^+$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame.

We exhibit three proofs:

*Proof.* By Theorem 8.6, the  $(\lambda, \lambda^+)$ -continuity of serial  $K^{sat}$ -independence property holds. By Fact 6.10(d),  $(K^{sat}, \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} \upharpoonright K^{sat})$  is closed under unions of increasing continuous sequences of cardinality less than  $\lambda^{++}$ . By Theorem 7.15, the relations  $\preceq \upharpoonright K^{sat}$  and  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  are equivalent. So  $(K^{sat}, \preceq \upharpoonright K^{sat})$  is closed under unions of increasing continuous sequences of cardinality less than  $\lambda^{++}$ . Therefore by Remark 2.16,  $(K^{sat}, \preceq \upharpoonright K^{sat})$  is an AEC in  $\lambda^+$ . So by Theorem 5.5,  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame minus amalgamation in  $\lambda^+$ . But by Theorem 7.15,  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$  is  $\mathfrak{s}^+$ . By Clause (4),  $\mathfrak{s}^+$  satisfies the amalgamation property in  $\lambda^+$ .  $\dashv$

*Proof.* By Theorem 7.15, the relations  $\preceq \upharpoonright K^{sat}$  and  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} \upharpoonright K^{sat}$  are equivalent. Since the relation  $\preceq \upharpoonright K^{sat}$  satisfies smoothness (because  $(K, \preceq)$  is an AEC), so too the relation  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} \upharpoonright K^{sat}$ . So by [9, Theorem 10.1.9],  $\mathfrak{s}^+$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame.  $\dashv$

*Proof.* Since the relations  $\preceq \upharpoonright K^{sat}$  and  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} \upharpoonright K^{sat}$  are equivalent, by the proof of [9, Proposition 10.1.12],  $\mathfrak{s}^{sat}$  (namely,  $\mathfrak{s}^+$ ) satisfies the symmetry axiom. Hence, by Theorem 4.2,  $\mathfrak{s}^+$  is a good non-forking  $\lambda^+$ -frame.  $\dashv$

## 10. MEANINGS OF GALOIS-TYPES

In this section, we show that even if the relations  $\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}$  and  $\preceq$  are not equivalent, the definitions of ‘a type’ in the different AECs considered here, coincide.

Let  $M_0, M_1$  be two models in  $K_{\lambda^+}$ . Suppose that  $M_0 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_1$  and  $a$  is an element in  $M_1 - M_0$ . Naturally, we have in mind two meanings of ‘the galois-type of  $a$ ’. On the one hand, we can consider the galois-type of  $a$  in  $M_1$  over  $M_0$  in the context of  $(K, \preceq)$ . On the other hand, we can consider the galois-type of  $a$  in  $M_1$  over  $M_0$  in the context of  $(K, \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF})$ . Moreover, if we consider restricting ourselves to the saturated models in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ , we get two additional meanings of ‘the type of  $a$ ’.

Formally, a galois-type is defined (at the beginning of Section 3) as an equivalence class of a relation,  $E$ .  $E$  is defined as the transitive closure of a relation,  $E^*$ . But  $E^*$  depends on the class of models and the relation between the models.

Theorem 10.6 says that in four specific pairs,  $(K', \preceq')$ , the definition of  $E^*$  coincides. So the four meanings of ‘the galois-type of  $a$ ’ coincide.

[9, Proposition 10.1.4] is similar to Theorem 10.6 but the proof of [9, Proposition 10.1.4] is wrong.

**Definition 10.1.** Let  $K' \subseteq K$  and let  $\preceq'$  be a binary relation on  $K'$  (or on  $K$ ) such that if  $M_0 \preceq' M_1$  then  $M_0 \preceq M_1$ . We define  $K^{3,K',\preceq'} := \{(M_0, M_1, a) : M_0, M_1 \in K', M_0 \preceq' M_1 \text{ and } a \in M_1 - M_0\}$ .

We define a binary relation  $E^{*,K',\preceq'}$  on the class of triples  $K^{3,K',\preceq'}$  by:  $(M_0, M_1, a_1)E^{*,K',\preceq'}(M_0, M_2, a_2)$  (in words ‘ $(M_0, M_1, a_1)$  and  $(M_0, M_2, a_2)$  are of the same galois-type in  $(K', \preceq')$ ’) if and only if there is an amalgamation  $(f_1, f_2, M_3)$  of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  over  $M_0$  such that  $M_3$  is in  $K'$ ,  $f_1[M_1] \preceq' M_3$ ,  $f_2[M_2] \preceq' M_3$  and  $f_1(a_1) = f_2(a_2)$ .

**Example 10.2.** The following examples are of interest for us:

- (1)  $K^{3,K_{\lambda^+},\preceq} = \{(M_0, M_1, a) : M_0, M_1 \in K_{\lambda^+}, M_0 \preceq M_1, M_0 \preceq M_2 \text{ and } a \in M_1 - M_0\}$ ,
- (2)  $K^{3,K^{sat},\preceq} = \{(M_0, M_1, a) \in K_{\lambda^+}^3 : M_0, M_1 \in K^{sat}\}$ ,
- (3)  $K^{3,K_{\lambda^+},\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}} = \{(M_0, M_1, a) \in K_{\lambda^+}^3 : M_0 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_1 \text{ and } M_0 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_1\}$ ,
- (4)  $K^{3,K^{sat},\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}} = K^{3,K^{sat},\preceq} \cap K^{3,K_{\lambda^+},\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}}$ .

**Proposition 10.3.** Let  $M_0, M_1$  and  $M_2$  be three saturated models in  $\lambda^+$  over  $\lambda$ . Let  $a_1 \in M_1 - M_0$  and let  $a_2 \in M_2 - M_0$ . Then  $(M_0, M_1, a_1)E^{*,K,\preceq}(M_0, M_2, a_2)$  holds if and only if  $(M_0, M_1, a_1)E^{*,K^{sat},\preceq}(M_0, M_2, a_2)$  holds.

*Proof.* If  $(M_0, M_1, a_1)E^{*,K^{sat},\preceq}(M_0, M_2, a_2)$  then by definition  $(M_0, M_1, a_1)E^{*,K,\preceq}(M_0, M_2, a_2)$ . Conversely, suppose  $(M_0, M_1, a_1)E^{*,K,\preceq}(M_0, M_2, a_2)$ . So is an amalgamation  $(f_1, f_2, M_3)$  of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  over  $M_0$  such that  $f_1(a_1) = f_2(a_2)$ . By Proposition 2.21, there is a model  $M_4 \in K^{sat}$  with  $M_3 \preceq M_4$ . So the amalgamation  $(f_1, f_2, M_4)$  is as needed.  $\dashv$

We restate [9, Proposition 7.1.13.b] as follows:

**Fact 10.4.** *Suppose:*

- (1)  $M_0 \prec_{\lambda^+}^+ M_1$ ,
- (2)  $M_0 \prec_{\lambda^+}^+ M_2$ ,
- (3)  $a_1 \in M_1 - M_0$ ,
- (4)  $a_2 \in M_2 - M_0$ ,
- (5) *for each  $N \in K_\lambda$  with  $N \preceq M_0$ , we have  $tp(a_1, N, M_1) = tp(a_2, N, M_2)$ .*

*Then there is an isomorphism  $f : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$  fixing  $M_0$  pointwise, such that  $f_1(a_1) = a_2$ .*


[A note: [9, Proposition 7.1.17.b] is a wrong application of [9, Proposition 7.1.13.b]. In order to fix it, we should add to its assumptions the assumption that  $M_0 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_1$  and  $M_0 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_2$ .]

**Proposition 10.5.** *Suppose  $(M_0, M_1, a_1)E^{*,K_{\lambda^+},\preceq}(M_0, M_2, a_2)$ . Then we can find an amalgamation  $(f_1, f_2, M_3)$  such that the following hold:*

- (1)  $M_3 \in K^{sat}$ ,
- (2)  $f_1(a_1) = f_2(a_2)$  and
- (3) *if  $M_0 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_1$  and  $M_0 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_2$  then  $f_1[M_1] \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_3$  and  $f_2[M_2] \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_3$ .*

*Proof.* By the definition of  $E^{*,K_{\lambda^+},\preceq}$ , there is an amalgamation  $(f_1, f_2, M_3)$  of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  over  $M_0$  such that  $f_1(a_1) = f_2(a_2)$ . If  $M_0 \not\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_1$  or  $M_0 \not\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_2$  then Condition (3) is irrelevant. In this case, we apply Proposition 2.21, replacing  $M_3$  by a model  $M_3^+$  such that  $M_3 \preceq M_3^+$  and  $M_3^+ \in K^{sat}$ .

Suppose  $M_0 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_1$  and  $M_0 \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_2$ . By Fact 7.9(1), we can take  $M_1^+, M_2^+$  such that  $f_1[M_1] \prec^+ M_1^+$  and  $f_2[M_2] \prec^+ M_2^+$ .



For every  $N \in K_\lambda$  with  $N \preceq M_0$ , we have  $tp(f_1(a_1), N, M_1^+) = tp(f_1(a_1), N, f_1[M_1]) = tp(f_1(a_1), N, M_3) = tp(f_2(a_2), N, M_3) = tp(f_2(a_2), N, f_2[M_2]) = tp(f_2(a_2), N, M_2^+)$ . So by Fact 10.4, we can find an isomorphism  $g : M_1^+ \rightarrow M_2^+$  fixing  $M_0$  pointwise such that  $g(f_1(a_1)) = f_2(a_2)$ . Now  $(g \circ f_1, f_2, M_2^+)$  is an amalgamation of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  over  $M_0$  as needed (by Fact 7.9(2),  $g \circ f_1[M_1] \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} g[M_1^+] = M_2^+$ ,  $f_2[M_2] \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF} M_2^+$  and  $M_2^+ \in K^{sat}$ ).  $\dashv$

By the following theorem,  $E^{*,K^{sat},\preceq}, E^{*,K_{\lambda^+},\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}}$  and  $E^{*,K^{sat},\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}}$  are the restrictions of  $E^{*,K,\preceq}$  to  $K^{3,K^{sat},\preceq}, K^{3,K_{\lambda^+},\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}}$  and  $K^{3,K^{sat},\preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}}$ , respectively.

**Theorem 10.6.** *The definitions of ‘galois-type’ in the following contexts coincide:  $\{(K_{\lambda^+}, \preceq), (K_{\lambda^+}, \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}), (K^{sat}, \preceq), (K^{sat}, \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF})\}$ .*

*More precisely: Let  $(K', \preceq')$  and  $(K'', \preceq'')$  be two pairs in  $\{(K_{\lambda^+}, \preceq), (K_{\lambda^+}, \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF}), (K^{sat}, \preceq), (K^{sat}, \preceq_{\lambda^+}^{NF})\}$ . Let  $(M_0, M_1, a_1), (M_0, M_2, a_2)$  be two triples in  $K^{3,K',\preceq'} \cap K^{3,K'',\preceq''}$ . Then*

$$(M_0, M_1, a_1)E^{3,K',\preceq'}(M_0, M_2, a_2) \Leftrightarrow (M_0, M_1, a_1)E^{3,K'',\preceq''}(M_0, M_2, a_2).$$

*Proof.* By Proposition 10.5. ⊣

Note that in the proof of [14, Conclusion II.8.7], the equivalence between the meanings of galois-types was not used (we quote: ‘the equality of types there is a formal, not the true one’). Theorem 10.6 gives a way to simplify the proof of [14, Conclusion II.8.7]. But since it is not a new result, we will not elaborate.

## 11. CONTINUATIONS

Several results and ideas that appear in the current paper, were already applied. In [12], we apply Theorem 1.6, proving that the class of primeness triples satisfies the existence property. We should study connections between the results here and the results of [14, III]. Vasey [18] continues Theorem 7.8 [18, Fact 11.15], doing an important step toward a proof of the categoricity conjecture.

**Acknowledgments.** First of all, I would like to thank God.

I wish to thank my wife for her support.

I wish to acknowledge wholeheartedly Prof David Webb for doing an outstanding work on improving the paper.

I would like to thank Efrat Taub, Sebastien Vasey, Will Boney and Prof Rami Grossberg for their comments and suggestions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] John T. Baldwin. Categoricity. A book in preparation. preprint available at <http://www.math.uic.edu/~jbaldwin/put/AEClec.pdf>
- [2] Will Boney. Tameness from large cardinal axioms. Journal of Symbolic Logic Vol 79, No 4, 1092-1119. December 2014.
- [3] Will Boney. Tameness and extending frames. preprint available at **arXiv preprint arXiv:1308.6006** (2013).
- [4] Will Boney and Rami Grossberg. Forking in short and tame AECs. preprint available at **arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.6562** (2013).
- [5] Will Boney, Rami Grossberg, Alexei Kolesnikov and Sebastien Vasey. Canonical forking in AECs. preprint available at **arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.1494** (2014).
- [6] Will Boney and Spencer Unger. Large cardinal axioms from tameness in AECs. Preprint available at <http://math.harvard.edu/~wboney/>

- [7] Will Boney and Sebastien Vasey. Tameness and frames revisited.
- [8] Rami Grossberg and Monica VanDieren. Galois-stability for tame abstract elementary classes. *Journal of Mathematical Logic* 6, No. 1 (2006), 25-49.
- [9] Adi Jarden and Saharon Shelah. Non-forking frames in Abstract Elementary Classes. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*. Volume 164, Issue 3, March 2013, Pages 135-191 DOI:10.1016/j.apal.2012.09.007
- [10] Adi Jarden and Saharon Shelah. Weakening the local character. Work in progress.
- [11] Adi Jarden and Saharon Shelah. Existence of uniqueness triples without stability. Work in progress.
- [12] Adi Jarden. Primeness triples in non-forking frames. Work in progress.
- [13] Adi Jarden and Alon Sitton. Independence of Sets Without Stability. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*. Volume 78, Number 2, June 2013 DOI: 10.2178/jsl.7802140
- [14] Saharon Shelah. Classification Theory for Abstract Elementary Classes. *Studies in Logic*. College Publications. [www.collegepublications.co.uk](http://www.collegepublications.co.uk), 2009. Binds together papers 88r,300,600,705,838 with introduction E53.
- [15] Saharon Shelah. Categoricity for abstract elementary classes with amalgamation. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 98 (1999) 261-294
- [16] Monica VanDiern and Sebastien Vasey. Transferring symmetry downward and application. Preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1508.03252v2.pdf>
- [17] Sebastien Vasey. Forking and superstability in tame AECs. Work in progress. Preprint available at <http://math.cmu.edu/~svasey/papers0>
- [18] Sebastien Vasey. Independence in abstract elementary classes. Submitted. Preprint available at <http://math.cmu.edu/~svasey/>

*E-mail address*, Adi Jarden: [jardena@ariel.ac.il](mailto:jardena@ariel.ac.il)

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS, ARIEL UNIVERSITY, ARIEL, ISRAEL